UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2605th MEETING: 13 SEPTEMBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2605)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the occupied Arab territories: Letter dated 11 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17456) . .	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2605th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 13 September 1985, at 3.15 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2605)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
   Letter dated 11 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17456)

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the occupied Arab territories:
Letter dated 11 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17456)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2604th meeting, I invite the representative of Qatar and the observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to take seats at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Israel and Jordan to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar) and Mr. Mansour (Palestine Liberation Organization) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Netanyahu (Israel) and Mr. Salah (Jordan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: I should also like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 12 September 1985 from the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request that I be allowed to participate in the Security Council's consideration of the item entitled 'The situation in the occupied Arab territories', in accordance with the provisions of rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian people."

4. On previous occasions the Security Council has extended invitations to representatives of other bodies of the United Nations in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation pursuant to rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian people.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17462, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 September 1985 from the representative of Jordan to the Secretary-General.

6. The first speaker on my list is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Observer of the League of Arab States, to whom the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure at the 2604th meeting. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like to convey to you, Mr. President, and through you to the members of the Security Council the deep appreciation of the League of Arab States for the kind invitation extended to me to make a statement today.

8. We in the Arab world detect at times a measure of impatience with our repeated resort to the Security Council. The degree of impatience varies from those who think we are testing their friendship to those who feel that we are forcing a veto on a simple draft resolution to prove a point. We in the Arab world are not oblivious to the view that repeated resolutions tend to be devalued in their meaning, that it is easier to ignore them, and that they transform this body into an arena in which confrontation is more important than results.

9. That view has been expressed to us, in one form or another, throughout the past months in order to limit the usefulness of this body as the proper mechanism for conflict resolution, especially in the Middle East, but also with regard to the questions of *apartheid* and of Namibia. In other words, some—particularly in some Western countries—would prefer that the anachronistic Israel and *apartheid* South Africa were provided with an immunity which would prevent the imposition against them of the necessary sanctions flowing from condemnation of their behaviour, practices and racist policies.

10. I want to make that statement in order to impress upon members of the Council that we—whether PLO, Lebanon or any other Arab country—are aware of our responsibilities when we come to the Security Council to seek redress for some of our legitimate grievances.

11. It has been said—indeed, it was said in this Chamber yesterday—that from the complaint to the Security Council one would think that we had turned to the Council because hundreds of thousands of Palestinians had been expelled. Let me make it very clear that this was done upon the initiative of the collective Arab Group. All the Arab States met and decided to come to the Security Council. Of course, we know that the expulsions, the restrictive measures, the deportations and the coercive measures that have been undertaken in the occupied Palestinian territories are part of a pattern. The measures taken in the last few weeks are probably the latest manifestation of an unfolding process.

12. For us, the question has been: Do we arrest this process? Can we invoke the authority of the Security Council and the United Nations and its machinery to arrest Israel's continued arrogation to itself of the right not only to undertake the demographic and geographic mutilation of the West Bank and Gaza, but also to deny the people in these areas a territory within which they can articulate their national identity and their political rights?

13. The question is much more profound than mere acts of deportation—than mere acts of destroying houses. It reveals a situation which is pregnant with great dangers for the future. We see today a growing polarization, with colonial settlers in the West Bank and Gaza undertaking militaristic activities. Not only are they seeking to annihilate the integrity of the territory on which the Palestinians can express self-determination, but they are also proceeding to establish new facts.

14. I should like to call those facts a "Kahanization" of the Israeli body politic. Of course, at this moment some Israelis would deny that Kahane represents anything more than a lunatic fringe, but it was once said that Sharon too represented a lunatic fringe; General Eytan represented a lunatic fringe; Shamir, Begin and others have at one time or another represented fringe groups in the overall Zionist body politic. It is our submission that inherent in Zionist policy and in Israeli behaviour is the potential "Kahanization" of the body politic.

15. We have seen how expulsion becomes a matter of ideological fulfilment. That is why, when we have recourse to the Security Council it is in order to arrest this process. The prospects for a just and comprehensive peace in the area are undermined if there is a certain level of permissiveness for one single settler. If these militarily-equipped settlers in the various occupied territories of Palestine are the target of guerrilla acts from within the occupied territories, the Israeli representative calls them "civilian targets". What constitutes a civilian target? Is not the establishment and proliferation of settlements in the occupied territories illegal? Is not the object of those settlements to pre-empt forever the right of the Palestinians to self-determination—a right which has been recognized by everybody?

16. When the Israelis label resistance activities in the West Bank and Gaza "acts of terrorism", it is identical to Mr. Botha in South Africa denouncing acts of legitimate resistance as "terrorism". Israel and South Africa are the two remaining entities in the world able to defy the United Nations, international law and the Charter of the United Nations; this is because they feel that they are shielded and immune from any sanctions against their actions.

17. Thus, unless the situation heats to the boiling point, it is the intention of the Arab States to resort to the Security Council in order to prevent the further escalation of a pattern which provokes a cycle of violence. We do so, not to devalue United Nations resolutions, but to enhance the value of the Security Council. We do so, knowing full well what awaits us; knowing full well that there are members of the Council reluctant to accept our assessment—although they might accept it when it is too late. There are members which intend to block any deterrence that this Council can apply in order to establish a climate of peace conducive to a just and comprehensive peace in the area.

18. We in the League of Arab States are aware that what is taking place today exemplifies what has been done in the past by the Israeli occupation authorities and, more important, is a sample of what might take place in the future if the process is not arrested at the proper moment. Inherent in this situation are incalculable dangers, with crisis-management becoming more and more difficult and ultimately impossible, with polarization reaching acute dimensions which could threaten not only peace in the region, but the basic rights of peoples everywhere. The ideology of violence has been spreading like an infection, and we have been trying to halt it. The resolutions of the Arab League summits are an investment in the option of peace.

19. That is why we believe the Security Council can prepare the ground for something that is vital—the convening of an international conference, under United Nations auspices, where all the issues that emerge from the Arab-Israeli conflict would be dealt with simultaneously in so far as they impact upon each other. Therefore, we think that a proper resolution that would deter and arrest the flow of violations by Israel in the occupied territories might be an investment in a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in a manner that would guarantee for the Palestinians the right to self-determination and the return of the occupied territories, and so we consider this meeting to be a very important path towards the ultimate resolution of the conflict.

20. However, if that path is not taken, if there is further escalation, the problems will become more complex, and what we are witnessing in what I call the "Kahanization" of Israel might continue, because the whole evolution of the Israeli body politic has proved that what is apparently perceived to be extreme today becomes the policy of tomorrow, unless it is arrested by the invocation of the credibility and effectiveness of the machinery of the United Nations and particularly of the Security Council.

21. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, Mr. Massamba Sarré. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. SARRÉ (Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People) (*interpretation from French*): "United Nations for a better world"—what a fine theme. In a few days' time, at the opening of the fortieth session of the General Assembly, we shall begin our work with that as our theme—a theme, but also a fine ideal, and, as with every ideal, it is rather asymptotic, but what is important is that we should do everything in our power to achieve it. That means putting aside passion and confrontation and trying to solve every conflict, whatever its scope, in a spirit of co-operation and understanding. In his report on the work of the Organization,[1] the Secretary-General has already set that tone, and I am sure that the ideas he has developed will be very much borne in mind, not only by the General Assembly, but above all by the Security Council, which is holding its last meeting before that great event to which we all look forward.

23. I wish first, Sir, to congratulate you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. We are personally familiar with your qualities as a diplomat well versed in international relations, coming as you do from a country that has shown the way as regards democracy and respect for human rights. We are also personally familiar with your devotion to the ideals of the United Nations. I am therefore convinced that under your leadership our work will be successful.

24. I wish also to take the opportunity, Sir, to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the Council's proceedings in August.

25. I also thank all the members of the Council for having permitted me, as Chairman of the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, to take part in the debate on Israeli practices against the population of the occupied Palestinian territories.

26. For all the members of our Committee the question before us, which goes to the very heart of our mandate, is all the more a cause of concern because it directly affects not only the future of the Palestinian population in the occupied territories but also international peace and security. The very fact that the Security Council is meeting to consider those practices confirms the profound concern of the international community about what is happening in the occupied territories and its consequences, which are very serious, to say the least.

27. In my letter to the Secretary-General of 11 September [*S/17455*], I gave details of the serious measures recently taken by the Israeli military authorities against the Palestinian population in the occupied territories. In an earlier letter, dated 8 August [*S/17392*], the Acting Chairman of the Committee had already expressed the Committee's deep concern about the decision taken by Israel to reinstate its policies of "administrative detention", detention that can last for as long as six months without trial, deportation of those considered to be a "threat to security", the tightening of censorship and other repressive measures against the Palestinian population.

28. According to several recent press reports, the military authorities have launched a massive campaign of detaining Palestinians under the policy that I have just described, and they are currently holding more than 50 people on the West Bank, 20 of whom were arrested on 2 September. Several people have also been arrested in Gaza. A curfew has been imposed in a number of towns—Jenin, Tulkarm, Nablus, Hebron, Gaza and others—and in a number of Palestinian refugee camps.

29. Three days ago, again according to press reports, Israeli army soldiers fired on four young Arabs, including a boy of 12, in Hebron; all were wounded.

30. Those measures have been taken in an atmosphere of growing provocation by Jewish settlers living in the occupied Palestinian territories, provocation clearly aimed at forcing the local population to emigrate. In all objectivity, we are compelled to point out that those acts of provocation have even been denounced by some of the occupying authorities.

31. After that brief survey of the situation—which has already been also made by preceding speakers—I wish simply to say that in the current year, in accordance with its mandate, the Committee has continued to follow

closely events directly affecting the question of Palestine and the rights of the Palestinians. In that regard it has spared no effort to promote the implementation of its recommendations. We have noted with growing concern that the situation in the occupied territories has continued to deteriorate.

32. As Chairman of the Committee, I have repeatedly and urgently drawn the attention of the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council to violations of the fundamental rights of the Palestinians by the Israeli authorities, in defiance of international law and relevant United Nations resolutions.

33. It is high time that the facts were faced. In the absence of any just and lasting solution to the Palestinian question—indeed, to the question of the Middle East—tension and violence will only increase in the Palestinian territories and the other occupied territories. The Committee has constantly stressed that the situation will only continue to deteriorate as long as the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people are not fully recognized. The United Nations without any doubt has the responsibility to ensure the fulfilment of these rights, as well as the physical protection of the Palestinians in the occupied territories and of other peoples of the region.

34. We believe that it is now up to the Council to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee and the recommendations adopted by consensus at the International Conference on the Question of Palestine, held at Geneva from 29 August to 7 September 1983. We would recall once again that these recommendations are solidly based on the internationally recognized fundamental principles regarding the Palestine question, which is the very heart of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

35. That is why, in its programme of work for this year, our Committee decided to continue, as a matter of priority, to do everything in its power to bring about the rapid convening of the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, in accordance with the recommendations of the Geneva Conference and General Assembly resolutions 38/58 C of 13 December 1983 and 39/49 D of 11 December 1984.

36. With that aim in view, the Committee, as the Council is aware, sent delegations to the capitals of several States members of the Council to consider the best ways of furthering the implementation of these recommendations. During those exchanges of views with Governments, the Committee stressed the overriding necessity to convene the Conference as soon as possible, and laid stress on the important role to be played by the Council in this field. The Committee was very much encouraged by the positive reaction of the Governments concerned, by their understanding of the need to take concrete measures urgently, and by their determination to contribute actively to the efforts to bring about a comprehensive and just settlement of the Palestine question, under the auspices of the United Nations.

37. In this regard, I should mention that during seminars and symposiums on the question of Palestine held by non-governmental organizations under the aegis of the Committee, participants vigorously stressed the high priority to be attached to this Conference, since it should open the way to a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the question.

38. On behalf of the Committee, I stress that the Palestine question has now reached a critical phase. We urge members of the Council to redouble their efforts to produce a just and lasting solution to this question.

39. For that purpose, what is needed is a debate free from all passion connected with immediate self-interests. First and foremost, this debate should be about the ways and means of convening the International Peace Conference on the Middle East.

40. The Committee is convinced that the International Peace Conference on the Middle East, which enjoys almost unanimous support, offers all the interested parties tremendous possibilities of participation in negotiations, which in their turn should lead to a just and lasting solution to the question. In the face of the constant deterioriation of the situation in the occupied territories, we appeal once again to the Council to take appropriate measures to revive, on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions of the Organization, the policy of dialogue among all the parties, in order to put an end to this tragic situation that has lasted all too long and to establish the just and lasting peace so long awaited by all the States and peoples of the Middle East.

41. Mr. MOHAMMED (Trinidad and Tobago): It is indeed a pleasure for my delegation to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. Your well-known diplomatic skills, together with your experience, will serve us in good stead this month.

42. My delegation also wishes to pay a tribute to Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the excellent manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of August.

43. The Security Council and the General Assembly have been seized of the problems of the Middle East for decades now. There is need for a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East. We believe that two essential elements of such a settlement are the right of the Palestinian people to statehood and a corresponding right of all States in the Middle East to live in peace and stability within secure borders. My delegation is of the view that positive efforts should be made to attain these objectives and we are concerned and disturbed by recent evidence which indicates that certain actions being taken would frustrate their attainment. My delegation considers such actions to be a threat to international peace and security and as such to require the attention of the Council.

44. Specific cases of curfews, detentions, deportations and repressive measures in the territories occupied by Israel, especially in the West Bank and Gaza, have been communicated to the Security Council; they have also been reported in the international media. My Government views these repressive measures in a wider context. If these actions are considered within the context of Israeli expropriation of land and the establishment of settlements, this would seem to indicate that the Israeli authorities are instituting a programme to change the very nature and character of these occupied territories and further frustrate the just aspirations of the Palestinian people. Such action in the occupied territories is contrary to international law and is unacceptable to the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

45. My delegation calls upon Israel to abide scrupulously by the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2]

46. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

47. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I have the pleasure at the outset of conveying to you, Sir, our best wishes and congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for this month. In view of your country's great knowledge of the problems of the Middle East and of the crises that beset this vital region, we are confident that you will impart your well-known wisdom to the Council's business.

48. We have the pleasure also of expressing our deep appreciation to Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Soviet Union—a country with which we maintain strong bonds of friendship and mutual respect. We congratulate him on the exemplary and objective manner in which he guided the Council's work during the past month.

49. The subject before the Council is not new. It is closely connected with the racist expansionist nature of Israel. Every racist expansionist entity must use violence, terrorism and repression in order to achieve its sinister objectives. Undoubtedly Israel, as its spokesmen themselves state, is the embodiment of settler colonialism, which can be carried out only through expulsion and displacement of hundreds of thousands of Arabs from the territories Israel occupies and the subjugation of those who remain by means of the iron fist, enslavement and humiliation. As members are well aware, such expulsion and displacement and the Judaization of these territories to create a so-called exclusively Jewish State have formed the ideological basis of the Zionist movement since the middle of the past century.

50. Since its establishment through aggression, and in pursuit of this ideology, Israel has consistently perpetrated the most heinous crimes so as to create an exclusively Jewish State which, in the view of Israeli theoreticians and politicians, would extend from the Nile to the Euphrates. Were it not for this ideology, together with Israel's policies and well-planned schemes, the Middle East crisis, the crux of which is the Palestinian question, would never have arisen. All members of the Council—indeed, all the Member States—have no doubt that this crisis constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

51. Therefore, we Arabs find ourselves in a life-and-death conflict with Israel, which still occupies our territories, displaces our people and seeks by every means to expel the indigenous population from their territory through the creation of circumstances which Israel believes—mistakenly—will force the Arabs to forego their struggle, surrender and leave their homeland. However, this Israeli wish is not being realized, since the popular uprising we are witnessing in occupied Palestine, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon is but the natural response to the policy of invasion, expansion and occupation, with its accompanying practices, the like of which have not been seen since the expansionist and racist nazism during the Second World War. The only similarity at present is the war being waged by the white minority régime in South Africa against our African brethren, who form 90 per cent of that country's population, and the revolt of its masses against the settler colonialists is escalating and broadening day by day.

52. One wonders why millions of Africans have still not succeeded in destroying *apartheid* and dismantling the minority régime and why the Arabs—with their great potential in every field—cannot confront the persistent Israeli invasion, despite their recognized absolute rights to self-defence and the liberation of their land which they can exercise by all means. The answer is that the two racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv are protected, supported and financed by United States imperialism, whose reach extends to many regions of our globe. Thus we Arabs in our region and the African people in South Africa find ourselves in an ongoing confrontation with those who support and protect those racist régimes.

53. The patriotic uprisings in the occupied Arab territories, on the one hand, and in South Africa, on the other, constitute the beginning of a full-scale struggle by the peoples of those two regions to rid themselves once and for all of injustice and foreign domination, regardless of the power of those protecting the racist régimes. Resistance, martyrdom and the protection of rights by all means available are the only alternative in opposing the racists, be it in South Africa, occupied Palestine, the Golan Heights or southern Lebanon, in order to defeat the invaders and occupiers.

54. We are proud to pay tribute from this rostrum to the struggle of those who fall on the battlefield, be it in South Africa, Palestine, the Golan Heights or southern Lebanon. We pay tribute also to their determination in opposing invasion regardless of sacrifice. Victory shall reward those who fight in defence of their homelands, their existence and their dignity. Victory for the peoples is a historic inevitability.

55. Until quite recently fabrications and lies have been heard from imperialist quarters to the effect that the so-called constitutional reforms in South Africa were capable of pre-empting the African revolution. But such concoctions, which were wrapped in the slogan of "constructive engagement", did not fool the masses, which lit the fires of the revolution to defend their human and national rights.

56. As for the Middle East—where resistance is intensifying and expanding—imperialism is trying to deflect the Arab national revolution by putting forth ideas intended only to pre-empt that revolution and that of the Palestinian people against the Zionist settler invasion, from which the region has suffered so much. But the struggling masses will continue their fight for liberation, because they are well aware of the nature of the racist aggressor and of the schemes to sow despair among the Arab people, thus putting out the flame of resistance in its soul. What is taking place in the West Bank, Gaza, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon shows that the determinations to resist is stronger than ever and follows the logic of history.

57. It is regrettable that successive American Administrations—in particular the current Administration, which has failed abysmally in its African policy—have made attempts at salvaging *apartheid* while keeping Israel—the equivalent of South Africa—afloat by marketing Israel under the guise of "democratic values". But that racist entity has been forcibly transplanted into our region by means of trampling underfoot the Palestinian people. In the Senate, the House of Representatives, all the branches of Government and the well-known media, Washington is widely propagating the lie of wide-scale democracy in Israel despite the fact that that "democracy" has displaced and continues to displace millions of Arabs, is occupying their territories, has besieged Beirut and still occupies parts of Lebanese territory and is planning more aggression and expansion, not to mention the killings, displacement, expulsion and exile. Perhaps one of the virtures of the so-called Israeli democracy is its endless greed for Arab territory and its unquenchable thirst for Arab blood. One example of the marketing of Israeli "democracy", so as to deceive the American people and take more of its money in taxes to support the racist, expansionist entity is what the United States Secretary of State said in Crystal City, Virginia, in a statement on 21 April 1985 at the Annual Conference of the American-Israeli Committee on Public Affairs. Mr. Shultz referred to one of the greatest American Presidents and said:

> "When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg of rededication to the cause of freedom, he was saying that the survival of liberty depended on people's faith in liberty."*

That is true, but he went on to say:

> "Israel's success as a thriving democracy helps sustain our faith in the democratic way of life not only in Amer ica but throughout the world. Today, the principles of freedom and democracy are more alive than when Israel was founded. The number of countries around the world that are democratic or on the road to democracy is growing. I believe the example of Israel and the United States has something to do with this heartening trend."*

58. What can we deduce from the words of Mr. Shultz? We know what to deduce. But what does an American layman deduce from what was said by the United States Secretary of State? What he deduces is very dangerous; it harms the Arab and Arab-American relations and also undermines international peace and security. What Mr. Shultz is driving at is that the more Israel expands and the fiercer it gets, the more it becomes free and democratic. The more the status of democracy improves in the world and the more Israel practises the policies of oppression, occupation, displacement and aggression, the more similar to the United States Israel becomes, for they are both democracies. Mr. Shultz continued:

> "No wonder, then, that the friendship between the American people and the people of Israel has grown so strong over the years."*

59. According to him, one of the most important aspects of the consolidation of this special organic relationship with Israel is that the latter is

> "a vital strategic ally in an important part of the world. The moral and personal bonds that tie us together have strengthened us both".*

What democracy indeed if they are mutually strengthened by oppressing and killing others?

60. The Secretary of State of that super-Power continued to emphasize the organic relationship of his country with usurper Israel and its unlimited commitment to the expansionist and aggressive Israeli policies. He went even further and said:

> "Through our material and moral support for Israel, our votes in the United Nations, and our efforts for peace . . . we are a permanent, steadfast and unshakeable ally of the State of Israel.
>
> "Every year we provide more security assistance to Israel than to any other nation. We consider that aid to be one of the best investments we could make—not only for Israel's security but for ours as well."*

61. As opposed to the absolute support for Israel, we find in the same statement made by Mr. Shultz a remarkable contempt of Arab reason and of the dignity of all Arabs when he says: "Both Arabs and Israelis trust us, and they seek our help." I wonder, is there an Arab who had asked for their help to consolidate the occupation of our territories and the humiliation of our citizens? We answer Mr. Shultz by saying that we cannot place our trust in the United States, which, as is well known, has made available all its unlimited resources for the consolidation of Israeli

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

occupation and the annexation of Arab territories, beginning with Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, thus encouraging Israel to pursue its acts of aggression and invasion against our nation.

62. In answer to Mr. Shultz's comment about the expansionist, racist nature of Israel—the Israel which the American Administration is trying to protect and market in the United States and in other places—I would merely quote the Israeli journalist, Danny Rubinstein, who wrote in *The New York Times* of 16 July 1985:

> "The truth is that there is no consensus on the fundamental question facing Israel today: whether we are willing to sacrifice democracy for the sake of holding on to the territories. The national consensus for condemning Rabbi Kahane and teaching democratic values merely allows us to evade this more difficult issue.
>
> "Meanwhile, daily life in Israel teaches just the opposite of democratic values. The 1.5 million Arabs in the territories have been living under Israeli occupation for 18 years—living alongside Israelis without sharing their rights. Our young people have grown up believing that nationalist struggle, terrorism and lawful discrimination are facts of life. Under such circumstances, how can one hope to teach democracy?"*

The same journalist revealed the racist prejudice in Israel against Arabs by recounting an incident that occurred during the strike of the stevedores in Israel:

> "Several years ago, during a crackdown on a stevedore strike, the leader of the striking union appeared on television and criticized the police. 'How dare they treat us like this. Are we Arabs from the territories?'"*

63. There is a universally recognized principle according to which occupation in itself is an act of aggression, in addition to its being a blatant violation of human and national rights in occupied territories. Therefore, whatever is taking place under the Zionist settler occupation must be seen through the inevitability of this oppression, which is in fact the reactor, the dynamo that moves the instincts of the racist society that is built on hatred of its victim. Therefore, an unconditional, speedy end must be put to the occupation. This necessitates the full Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its inalienable rights, foremost among which is its right of return, its right to self-determination and its right to the establishment of an independent State on its national soil. Until then, the international community must support the struggle of the Palestinian people to restore its usurped rights.

64. We say to the representative of the enemy that his invocation of articles 49 and 78 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] was specious—a mere attempt at misleading. The Council is duty-bound to stress to him that by virtue of articles 49 and 147 of the Convention, expulsion and deportation, whether individual or collective, constitute war crimes.

65. We should like to remind the Council that honesty dictates recognition of the fact that Israel caused the forced exodus of about a million people in 1948 and of half a million people in 1967. It forcibly removed about 128,000 citizens from the occupied Syrian Golan Heights and 30,000 people from the Demilitarized Zones which were under the supervision of the United Nations. Up to now these people have not been allowed to exercise their right of return in accordance with article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

66. The statement of the representative of the enemy in his letter dated 9 September [*S/17448*] was only an attempt to categorize Bethlehem, El-Bireh, Jerusalem, Nablus, and Tulkarm, as Israeli cities, faking forgetfulness of article 47 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which strictly prohibits the annexation of occupied territories, in whole or in part. We suggest he read page 275 of the 1958 edition of the Commentary on the Fourth Geneva Convention—specifically article 47, which sprang from the conscience of the nations as a result of Nazi Germany's annexation of a number of countries during the Second World War.

67. Israel is responsible not only for its crimes resulting from the expulsion of the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories, but for the crime of transferring the foreign settlers to the occupied territories. That, too, is a war crime, under the provisions of the aforementioned Convention and its Additional Protocol I.[3]

68. One of these days we must apply against the Israeli officials, whether individually or collectively, the punitive measures envisaged in articles 146, 147, and 148 of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

69. The Security Council must once again compel Israel to respect the Fourth Geneva Convention whose applicability Israel altogether denies and yet its representatives turn round and invoke it at the Security Council. By not acknowledging that it applies to the occupied Arab territories, they threaten the international legal structure which is universally applied to civilians under occupation. Selective invocation and quotation of portions of articles of the Geneva Convention shows a lack of respect for the intelligence of the international community and constitutes a violation of the Council's norms of behaviour and morality.

70. We wish finally to observe that the provisions of the draft resolution before the Council [*S/17459*], are not commensurate with the gravity of the situation created by Israel in the West Bank, Gaza and other occupied territories through its oppressive measures, which violate the most elementary rules of international law governing foreign occupation. We believe that the draft resolution should have contained an explicit condemnation of Israel for its actions, and a strong condemnation of all acts of

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

terrorism carried out by Israel against the Arabs, especially individual and official Israeli terrorism and the mass punishment and killing of innocent people. We would have expected also to see in the draft resolution a paragraph paying tribute to the heroic Arab resistance against Israeli occupation.

71. Mr. ZIDOUEMBA (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): Permit me first of all, Sir, to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. Your qualities as an able diplomat and negotiator are well known to all, and in our view guarantee the success of our deliberations.

72. I wish also to express my delegation's thanks to Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for the skill, wisdom and ability with which he presided over the Council last month.

73. It take this opportunity further to welcome, on behalf of the delegation of Burkina Faso, the representatives of the People's Republic of China and Peru, countries with which Burkina Faso maintains excellent relations of co-operation.

74. For some weeks now, the violence of the Israeli occupation has again had a brutal impact upon the civilian population of the Arab territories illegally placed by Israel under its domination, particularly the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

75. After having reinstated in those territories the law of so-called preventive detention, the Israeli military forces have since 4 August been engaging in a series of repressive measures, including the imposition of curfews, arbitrary arrests, expulsions and administrative detentions without trial.

76. Moreover, the Israeli authorities have announced their intention to take military action against countries in the region harbouring offices of the PLO. The detailed information provided yesterday [*2604th meeting*] by the representative of Qatar and the observer for the PLO clearly shows the seriousness of the situation which brings us together here today. With its measures and its threats, Israel is seeking by intimidation totally to destroy the will to resist in the populations of the occupied territories. Their resistance is a legitimate one, which Israel and its friends stubbornly liken to simple acts of terrorism.

77. No one can honestly describe as terrorism the struggle of an oppressed and exploited people against its oppressor. That was true during the Second World War, when resistance movements were formed all over the world to fight against nazi domination and oppression. It was also true of colonized peoples in their liberation struggle against the colonial Powers, and is true today in South Africa, where 24 million Blacks, Coloureds and Indians have mobilized to rid South African society of racism and exploitation based on the vile system of *apartheid*. This unchanging truth also motivates and strengthens Palestinian resistance in the occupied territories.

78. The establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East requires, first of all, the solution of the Palestinian problem. To that end, Israel should be realistic and courageous and decide to recognize the identity of the Palestinian people, and should negotiate with it through its sole, authentic representative, the PLO. Once that prerequisite is satisfied, we can hope at last for an end to the violence and insecurity which are the daily lot of the States and peoples of the region.

79. On the basis of that conviction, we have joined other non-aligned countries members of the Council in sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document S/17459. In that text the Council deplores the measures recently taken by Israel against civilian Palestinian populations in the occupied Arab territories, and calls upon Israel immediately to cease all repressive measures in accordance with the Geneva Convention on the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] That is the least the Council can expect of any State, including Israel. For that reason, my delegation hopes that the Council will be able without any difficulty to adopt this draft resolution unanimously.

80. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Jordan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

81. Mr. SALAH (Jordan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As the Security Council considers the situation in the West Bank and Gaza, which is deteriorating as a result of the intensification of Israel's arbitrary practices against the Palestinian population in that area, it should not lose sight of two fundamental facts.

82. First, Israel's occupation of these territories is entering its eighteenth year. The nature and philosophy of this occupation are different from those of any other similar occupation, owing to the fact that by this philosophy the Israeli occupation authorities consider the indigenous population, to which the territory legitimately belongs, to be foreigners, with no right to their own country and land. The Palestinians' presence there being merely "temporary", the Israelis therefore have the "right"—in their view—to make free with those territories and settle them by force, encroaching on the inhabitants' means of livelihood and even on their very existence on their own land. The escalating provocation against those Palestinians has reached such a level that groups of Israeli fanatics, led by a member of the Israeli Knesset, have called publicly for the expulsion of *all* Palestinians from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

83. Secondly, there is a new generation of Palestinian young people who were born under that hateful occupation and have lived under it; and some of them are already 18. They know only the Israeli military authorities, the forces of occupation and the extremist settlers, who deal

with this generation and the population in general through the logic of force, terror and humiliation. That generation spontaneously resists the occupation because of the practices perpetrated against it, as has been confirmed by some Israelis.

84. In that connection, I wish to quote the Israeli professor Mark Heller, of the Institute for Strategic Studies at the University of Tel Aviv, in a recent interview with an American newspaper:

> "But Professor Heller added that perhaps the most important factor, and the one that explains why so many young Palestinians seem to be ready to take up violence against Israelis without any apparent directives from the PLO, is the coming of age in the West Bank of a new generation of Arabs that 'has known no other administration than the Israeli military government.'"*

Professor Heller came to the following conclusion about that generation:

> "They are themselves in a direct political conflict with Israel. It is not that they believe what they are doing will necessarily make a difference; it is rather that they don't have any faith in anyone else anymore or have any other methods."*

85. One can understand the truth of the situation of the Palestinian population in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip only by realizing the magnitude of the frustration, suffering and despair it is experiencing as a result of the continued brutality of the occupation and the weakening of its belief in the possibility of its salvation through a just and comprehensive peace. Despite those self-evident facts, the Israeli officials continue to adhere to their usual tactic of blaming others and considering them to be responsible. The least that can be said about such a policy is that it is the policy of burying one's head in the sand and failing to face up to reality. Persistence with such a policy leads to obstruction of the peace endeavours under way and the creation of tension and turmoil in the region, which serves only the enemies of peace and the forces of extremism and terrorism.

86. I shall not recount Israel's practices of oppression, which have escalated recently in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Previous speakers have spoken about them, and the details of those practices are to be found in numerous letters distributed to members of the Council. But I wish to point out that the Security Council and the General Assembly have already adopted a number of resolutions on the situation in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip and on the Israeli practices. Those resolutions emphasize the following points and principles: first, the illegality and illegitimacy of the Israeli actions aimed at altering the demographic and geographic status of the occupied territories, including the building of Israeli settlements, which were declared to be a grave obstacle on the path to peace; secondly, the necessity of Israel's fully complying with the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2]; thirdly, the preservation of the safety and security of the civilian population; and, fourthly, the rejection of Israeli practices based on the policy of collective punishment, administrative detention and the expulsion and deportation of citizens.

87. We believe that if the Council had insisted on Israel's compliance with those resolutions it would not have found itself facing such a deteriorating situation in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The only solution to the suffering of the Palestinian population in those territories is an end to the occupation, through the establishment of a just and comprehensive peace, as called for by all international resolutions.

88. Jordan, which realizes more than others the magnitude of the suffering of the Palestinian people under occupation, has emphasized consistently and continuously the necessity of achieving a comprehensive, peaceful settlement. Jordan seeks actively to revive the peace endeavours, which would put an end to the continued Israeli occupation and guarantee the rights of the peoples of all the States of the region to live in security and peace. The Jordanian-Palestinian agreement, which was based on the principles acknowledged by the Council and was ratified by Jordan and the PLO on 11 February 1985, was the embodiment of that faith and a commitment to achieving a comprehensive settlement, with the participation of the PLO, as the legitimate representative of the Palestinians, in the peace process.

89. We hope that the Council will adopt the draft resolution [*S/17459*], since that is the least it can do to maintain the security and safety of the population of the occupied territories at this stage.

90. Mr. LI LUYE (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): I warmly congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I have no doubt that, with your outstanding diplomatic skills, you will be able to guide the Council efficiently to accomplish its tasks. I also thank you and other representatives for the welcome extended to me. In discharging my duties and functions as a member of the Council, I shall spare no effort to co-operate closely with you and my other colleagues.

91. Your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, presided dynamically over the proceedings of the Council last month, and I take this opportunity to thank him.

92. Since 4 August this year, when the Israeli authorities declared the reintroduction of administrative detention in the West Bank and Gaza, they have taken a series of repressive actions in the occupied territories, trampling on the fundamental right to survival of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and inflicting loss of life and property.

93. In his statement on 12 September [*2604th meeting*] the observer for the PLO thoroughly exposed and denounced these illegal activities of the Israeli authorities.

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

The Chinese Government is deeply concerned over the deterioration of the situation in the occupied territories caused by the Israeli authorities and extends its profound sympathy and support to the Palestinian and other Arab peoples there, who are faced with serious difficulties.

94. The Chinese delegation holds that the decision by Israel to carry out administrative detentions and deportations is in violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and should therefore be repealed immediately. The Israeli authorities must also stop forthwith all their repression and intimidation against the Palestinian and other Arab peoples and ensure to them their legitimate right of existence.

95. It is both reasonable and justifiable for the Palestinian people and the Arab countries to demand that Israel stop its illegal activities in the occupied Arab territories and implement the relevant provisions contained in the aforementioned Geneva Convention. The Security Council should render them its support in this regard. The Chinese delegation therefore supports the draft resolution on this issue proposed by the non-aligned caucus [*S/17459*].

96. It is our consistent belief that the Palestinian issue is the crux of the Middle East problem, having a direct bearing on peace and stability in the Middle East region. The key factors to the solution of the Middle East question are that the national rights of the Palestinian people must be restored and that Israel must withdraw from all the Arab territories it has occupied since 1967, including Arab Jerusalem. This is the only basis on which a comprehensive, just and durable peace can be achieved in the Middle East. The Security Council should make further efforts towards this goal.

97. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): I do not necessarily wish to surrender to a tradition that could easily become a mere ritual, but I wish in all sincerity and simplicity to say how happy my delegation is, Sir, that you have assumed the presidency of the Council for the month of September. It is said that history is strewn with imponderables. If a century ago your Government had not shown such a predilection for the spices of Zanzibar, I should perhaps have been able to address you today in the language of Shakespeare. However that may be, and without wishing to harm the excellent past and present relations between our two peoples and Governments, I would ask you to allow me to make my observations and to express our best wishes to you in the language of Corneille and Racine.

98. Mr. Oleg Alexandrovich Troyanovsky, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, we express our gratitude for the equanimity, objectivity and method with which he discharged his functions as President of the Council last month. We found in him a very attentive listener to our aspirations and concerns—always out of a concern to preserve concord among us.

99. Finally, I take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to bid welcome to the new representative of the People's Republic of China, as well as to my neighbour on the left, the representative of Peru, with whom I have already had the honour and privilege of working here in the United Nations.

100. The decision taken on 4 August by the Israeli authorities to apply once again in the occupied Palestinian territories a series of measures already regarded as illegal has led to the foreseeable reactions and, because of their nature and scope, has threatened international peace and security. The representative of Qatar, Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of September, therefore quite rightly requested, in his letter of 11 September, the immediate convening of the Council.

101. The facts are known. They have been reported in detail by previous speakers, in particular the Observer of the PLO [*2604th meeting*]. The measures taken by the Israeli occupying authorities include administrative detention that can last as long as six months and the deportation of persons considered to be a threat to security. But it would seem that the judicial protection against arbitrary action that has been set before us is only illusory, because recourse to it can be considered only as suspensions of these measures.

102. In fact, the Israeli authorities could have confined themselves to police measures to keep the peace and maintain order. But, as was to be expected, they chose—faithful to their policies of escalation and extremism—to engage in the military or paramilitary operations which have resulted in a systematic campaign of massive detention of Palestinians on the West Bank and in Gaza and in the establishment of curfews as well as the carrying out of collective punishments.

103. Together with this, there is the Israeli threat to launch direct military operations against the offices of the PLO in Amman and other places, as well as growing provocations by the Israeli settlers, encouraged by extreme statements by some Israeli authorities with regard to the very presence of Palestinians in Palestine. All those measures, the members of the Council will understand, serve only to exacerbate tension in the region, and it is quite clear that the Palestinians are in no way responsible for this.

104. The General Assembly, particularly in resolution 35/122 of 11 December 1980, as well as the Security Council in its resolutions 468 (1980), 469 (1980) and 484 (1980), confirmed the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] to the Arab territories that have been occupied by Israel since 1967. The first paragraph of article 49 of that Convention expressly states that:

> "Individual or mass forcible transfers, as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the Occupying Power or to that of any other country, occupied or not, are prohibited, regardless of their motive."

and I stress the words "regardless of their motive".

105. No imperatives of security or of public order can legitimize Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories, since the incidents reported in the region and invoked to justify these measures derive from the very fact of Israel. Israel's persistence in applying and intensifying its settlement policy provokes the resistance of the Palestinian people, whose opposition to military occupation cannot be described as terrorism except by the occupying Power itself.

106. We remain convinced, in spite of explanations put forward, that Israeli practices have affected the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and constitute repeated grave and flagrant violations of international law, in particular of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Fourth Geneva Convention. That is why we believe that the Council must take action to prevail upon Israel to comply strictly with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and desist immediately from administrative detentions, internments, forcible expulsion and imposition of curfews, which serve it only the better to carry out its policies of repression and oppression.

107. Israel must put an end to its defiance of international public opinion and understand that a comprehensive, just and lasting solution that will make it possible for the Palestinian people to exercise their inalienable rights is the only alternative to a situation of arbitrary rule, abuses and injustice.

108. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I had the pleasure yesterday of telling you, Sir, how pleased I was to join the Council under your very able presidency, and I repeat that sentiment today. I want also to express my delegation's appreciation of the excellent work done by my good friend, Mr. Troyanovsky, as President last month. I also wish cordially to express my thanks for the words of welcome extended to us today by fraternal delegations.

109. As co-sponsors of draft resolution S/17459, we want to express our concern over the worsening of the situation in the occupied Arab territories by virtue of the measures taken by the occupying military authorities against the civilian population.

110. Interested in contributing to the establishment of conditions that can lead to a just peace for all parties in the Middle East, Peru has participated in all attempts to stem the process of deterioration, of which the recent events are an additional serious factor.

111. As part of that same desire for peace and justice in the area, we reiterate that concern and the urgent need for an end to the measures taken against the Palestinian population and for the occupying forces strictly to observe the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] which it is our duty to ensure.

112. Therefore the non-aligned countries are submitting the aforementioned draft resolution, whose adoption should be a reflection of the Council's concern over the worsening of security in the area.

113. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): I should like at the outset to say how pleased my delegation is to see you, Sir, presiding over our deliberations. The historic and cordial relations of friendship and co-operation between our two countries further enhance my pleasure in congratulating you most warmly and sincerely upon your assumption of the presidency for this month. My delegation is convinced that with your wisdom, high competence and renowned diplomatic skill, the business of the Council will be conducted in a very successful and effective manner during the important month of September.

114. I take this opportunity also to associate myself with the well-deserved tributes paid by previous speakers to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for his highly competent and dignified stewardship of the Council during the month of August. We note in particular the fact that the Council's plan to convene a commemorative meeting was finalized and agreed upon during his presidency.

115. I wish also to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Li Luye and Mr. Carlos Alzamora Traverso, who have recently taken up their assignments as representatives of the People's Republic of China and Peru, respectively. With their wealth of diplomatic experience and extensive knowledge of international affairs, they should prove to be distinct assets not only in the conduct of diplomacy of their respective countries but also for the Organization.

116. The question of the plight of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories is indeed not a new question before the Council. The Palestinians have long been victims of arbitrary measures by the occupying Power in the occupied territories. Moreover, the question of Palestine constitutes the core of the Middle East problem and holds the key to peace and security in the region as a whole. The position of my Government has been consistent in support of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and in the earnest hope of achieving a peaceful and just solution to the problem. Therefore I should like once again to reiterate Thailand's policy on this matter as follows.

117. First, Thailand firmly supports all relevant United Nations resolutions on the question of Palestine, in particular Security Council resolution 242 (1967) on the Middle East, which constitutes the only agreed basis for solving the problem peacefully.

118. Secondly, Thailand supports unequivocally the legitimate aspirations and the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination, the right to national independence and sovereignty and the right to return safely to their homes and properties.

119. Thirdly, Thailand holds that any acquisition of another State's territory by force contravenes one of the internationally recognized principles. In this connection,

we have consistently called for the withdrawal of the Israeli presence from all Arab territories occupied since 1967.

120. Having heard the statements of previous speakers, in particular of the representative of Qatar in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States and the observer for the PLO [*ibid.*], my delegation wishes to register again its grave concern over the plight of the Palestinian population in the occupied territories, in particular in the West Bank and Gaza. The situation remains unchanged—indeed it has worsened—because it is apparent that the occupying authorities have exercised their administrative power to the detriment of the Palestinian people. The measures—namely, reinstating the policies of administrative detention for up to six months without trial, deportation of persons who are considered security risks, increased censorship, as well as the imposition of other measures against the Palestinian people—are in direct contravention of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] to which Israel is a party.

121. To name a few: administrative detention is in violation of the third paragraph of article 5 of the Convention which stipulates that in case of trial the protected persons shall not be deprived of the rights of fair and regular trial prescribed by the Convention. Article 49 of the Convention prohibits individual or mass forcible transfers, as well as deportations of protected persons from occupied territory to the territory of the Occupying Power or to that of any other country, regardless of their motive. Such measures and actions taken by Israeli authorities, if they should continue, would not only exacerbate tensions and conflict in the area but also constitute a serious obstruction to the efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, with serious implications for international peace and security in general.

122. My delegation also listened with attention and interest to the statement of the representative of Israel yesterday [*ibid.*]. However, my delegation is still of the opinion that in the situation under consideration, namely, in the occupied territories, particularly in the West Bank and Gaza, the parties concerned, particularly the occupying Power, must strictly observe the relevant provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Moreover, the burden of proof should not rest on the occupied population but, rather, on the occupying authorities. In short, Israel has to prove beyond reasonable doubt that no measure prohibited by the Fourth Geneva Convention has been taken against the Palestinian people. In the absence of such proof, any benefit of the doubt should be conferred upon the people who are living under the yoke of foreign occupation.

123. In this connection, it should also be noted that the prolonged occupation of those territories by Israel is responsible for the actions of the people cited by Israel as the cause for its repressive measures. Indeed, the occupying Power has made an admission that the deportation of Palestinians has actually taken place. That measure is therefore, at least *prima facie*, a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, regardless of the number of deportees involved, and Israel must accordingly be held accountable in this regard.

124. In the light of the aforementioned, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document S/17459.

125. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): We congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and wish you success in your conduct of its proceedings, particularly in such a difficult and arduous month.

126. We wish also to pay tribute to the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Troyanovsky, for his skilful conduct of the Council's work during August. His vast diplomatic experience and erudition promoted solutions to many difficult problems.

127. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic also associates itself with the congratulations extended to the representatives of China and Peru.

128. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic supported the request for the emergency consideration by the Council of the repressive measures by the Israeli authorities against the Arab Palestinian population of the occupied territories. The dangerous nature of the situation which has arisen as a result of those measures is demonstrated by the statements in the Council of the observers for the PLO and the League of Arab States [*ibid.*], as well as the alarming reports which have been coming in.

129. Our attention has been drawn once again to the explosive situation in the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel and the need for taking of immediate and effective measures to put an end to the violence of the occupationists.

130. As emerges from the reports we have had, the occupying authorities have created a situation of terror and opened fire on helpless Palestinians, including women and children. They are carrying out mass arrests in accordance with the 4 August 1985 legislation on administrative detention. The authorities are inciting hatred towards the Palestinians among the Israeli settlers. There can be no doubt that these actions are a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and of the decisions and resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

131. The scale of the arbitrary implementation of that legislation in the occupied territories is demonstrated by many reports in the press which have repeatedly been quoted in the United Nations. Suffice it to point out that 87 per cent of the adult population in Palestinian refugee camps have been subject to arrest or detention. Thousands of times the occupationists used their weapons, resulting in

the killing and wounding of about 650 Palestinians, including more than 100 women and children.

132. The most recent wave of repression and terror in the occupied territories is aimed at creating an atmosphere of terror among the Palestinians, forcing them to leave their ancestral homes to create so-called living space for the Israeli settlers. The implementation of these criminal acts—criminal from the point of view of international law—by Israel and its disregard of decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly have been made possible by the direct economic, military, political and diplomatic assistance and support from the United States. As a result of this position, all proposals aimed at solving the Palestinian problem have been blocked.

133. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic categorically condemns the aggressive expansionist policy of Israel and its most recent acts of repression against the Palestinians in the occupied territories. We are in favour of the immediate cessation of those actions and support the draft resolution contained in document S/17459.

134. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

135. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

136. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to thank you very much indeed, Sir, for allowing me to speak during the final moments of these meetings of the Security Council. I congratulate you on the manner in which you have presided over these meetings. I also congratulate and thank your predecessor for the valuable services he offered to the Council last month.

137. In the Holy Koran, verses 39 and 40 of surah XXII, we read:

> "Sanction is given unto those who fight because they have been wronged; and Allah is indeed able to give them victory;
>
> "Those who have been driven from their homes unjustly only because they said: Our Lord is Allah—For had it not been for Allah's repelling some men by means of others, cloisters and churches and oratories and mosques, wherein the name of Allah is oft mentioned, would assuredly have been pulled down. Verily Allah helpeth one who helpeth Him. Lo! Allah is strong, almighty."

138. I am sure no one in the Council or in the audience can deny the significance or the appropriateness of these verses with regard to the issue under consideration. The verses I just recited contain the divine mandate, the powerful and most valid, and as a matter of fact the only valid permission for the Palestinian Moslems to fight against the Zionist occupiers and in defense of their God-given rights. In addition, in verse 190 of surah II of the Holy Koran, we have: "Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you . . .".

139. These verses are addressed not simply to the Palestinian Moslems, who happen to be the most appropriate example of these verses, but to all Moslems, to all the millions of Moslems. To defend the holy land of Palestine, to liberate the Islamic sanctuaries from Zionist occupation, to re-hoist the flag of Palestine and to revive the State of Palestine under the banner of Islam are all Islamic duties which apply to all Moslems. The Holy Koran commands and orders all Moslems, in verse 60 of surah VIII:

> "Make ready for them all thou canst of (armed) force and of horses tethered that thereby ye may dismay the enemy of Allah and your enemy, and others beside them whom ye know not. Allah knoweth them."

140. Instead of unifying all their resources and the present-day strings of horses against the Zionist usurpers, some members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference—by that I mean some of our Islamic countries—resort to the Security Council and remain satisfied with draft resolutions, many of which—all similar to each other—have so often been adopted in the past, in order to cool down the champions of support for Palestine and also to please the Zionist enemy by that cooling-down process.

141. The history, and even the contemporary history, of Lebanon and Palestine has convinced even the Council members that what has been taken by force must be taken back by force, the only language that the Zionist enemy understands.

142. It is a waste of time to elaborate and to enumerate what the Zionist usurpers have done in the past or in recent days in the occupied territories. We have to finish the occupation, not analyse the terms and the modalities of it. But regrettably it has been most difficult to bring our Moslem brothers together under the banner of Islam on this issue.

143. Ever since we forgot our Islamic identity and emulated the circular, satanic models of secular society, we have been forced to do things as they please and as their norms want us to do; therefore we waste our time in the Council waiting for it to restore justice for us—at least, in terms of resolutions.

144. However, this body is meant to negotiate, to give a chance to the angry and oppressed to release energy and cool down. That is the function of the Security Council.

145. Mr. President, as you know very well, by entering into negotiation with the illegal, illegitimate enemy, one gives recognition to oppression, to occupation and to illegitimate, lawless practices.

146. In this body, the aggressor and the victim, the oppressor and the oppressed become equal and equally legitimate. The illegitimate Zionist base of imperialism becomes a party to negotiations. This is wrong.

147. But in an Islamic struggle the case is different. There the oppressed race to eradicate injustice, not to negotiate. They race to demolish illegitimate edifices and in so doing to try to carry out a divine spiritual obligation; this leads to justice and provides for further spiritual enhancement. Justice is the natural equilibrium which the divine hand has inscribed for our social order. It is the social equivalent of the equilibrium which exists throughout nature: in the heavens, in the stars, in the moon, in the sun, in the galaxies, and in the beauty of flowers—everywhere. Just as no one can deny that equilibrium, no one can deny the prescriptive equilibrium which must be maintained in human society on the basis of divine prescriptions.

148. Those who ignore divine law and seek justice in the trivial secular artificialities on which we have been wasting our time for the past 38 years of the occupation of Palestine deserve the humiliation which they proudly claim for themselves.

149. I am sure we all know what would be involved if the Arab world really wanted to act according to Islam and were to make ready for it all the forces and the strings of horses of today's Islamic countries. All the assets of the Moslem countries in the Zionist banks in the United States; all the resources, the oil, the manpower of Egypt, the Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Palestine, Morocco, Algeria and so many other military and other Powers; all their markets and economic resources; and, above all, their hands and brains—all would be mobilized and utilized according to the way of God. Our strings of horses and our present-day forces would be mobilized against the enemy.

150. If they could co-ordinate only one fifth of all those resources, I am sure that the Zionist occupiers would find it absolutely uneconomical to stay in Palestine any longer. They would just go. But when the Islamic dicta and rulings are forgotten, the Zionist enemy can occupy and expand its occupation; it can deport, destroy and kill. And we sit in the Council chamber fighting for a draft resolution. That is the tragedy of the Moslem world.

151. To please our brothers who have appealed to the Council, my delegation supports draft resolution S/17459, in which the Council only deplores the crimes of the Zionist usurpers. It even begrudges a stronger word—quite apart from the fact that even this petty offering might be vetoed. We, and the members of the Council, should see that it is a shame that the entire Moslem world is ignoring its religious duties and pretends to be absolutely, innocently ignorant of them, and, like a day-dreaming child, makes its complaints to its tedddy bear, its beloved Security Council, which might in the end deplore what the Zionist enemy has been doing to Palestine and to the Palestinian Moslems.

152. The struggle of the Lebanese people has made it evident that this once-invincible enemy—an enemy which in 1967 the entire Arab army could not resist for more than six days—can be defeated, and even with a small army. But where are the wise eyes and ears to see and listen to the best lesson of our contemporary history?

153. Like many good members of the Council, we too believe in justice, but we do not believe that justice can be achieved simply by the Security Council.

154. Our position is quite clear. We believe that the Moslem world must conduct itself according to Islam in order to restore its rights and to hoist once again the flag of Palestine over the entire Islamic land of Palestine. I beg our Moslem brothers, Arabs and non-Arabs, to join hands on the basis of Islam and to establish a united Islamic front.

155. Just as we are ready to join them in the Council, I ask our brothers please to join us to defeat the enemy and to defend our Palestine at the battle-front. I assure them that if they do so this very Council will happily adopt any resolution that pleases them, because they will be powerful and victorious, and worthy of respect and reverence from those who recognize no right but power. I believe that many in this Chamber, including members of the Council, agree with me.

156. The Zionist non-entity is really nothing. It must be defeated, and it can be defeated very easily. The Moslem nation is really a great, superior and able nation. I am sure that it is capable of eliminating the cancer of zionism from the Middle East and that it will do so very soon.

157. The PRESIDENT: I hope that in his speech the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran was not advocating courses of action contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, the acceptance of which is a condition of membership of the Organization. If he wishes to do so, the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran will be able to speak in reply in due course.

158. The next speaker is the representative of Israel. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

159. Mr. NETANYAHU (Israel): It is instructive sitting here this afternoon, receiving lectures about human rights, democracy and democratic values from the likes of the representatives of Syria and a few other countries. We owe a special, warm debt to the last speaker, the representative of Iran, who grew tired of the dissimulation of some speakers and called the proceedings and the statements of those

speakers what they are. He was clearly exhorting a holy war, a jihad. There is no question about that. Everyone heard it.

160. We are talking here about deportation. I have heard that word come up several times during the present discussion. The representative of Iran unabashedly tore the mask off what some representatives have been calling for—the deportation of a State, of an entire people, a holy war.

161. I heard the representative of Syria speak on behalf of the tortured Palestinians. I ask him: who is killing Palestinians in the Bekaa? Who is killing them in Tripoli? Who is killing them in Beirut? Who is killing them in Sidon? Who is killing them in Damascus? Yasser Arafat is very specific about that, and at least he deserves to be heard on Syria. He said, as reported in *Der Spiegel* in July:

> "In Damascus, in the Palestinian camp of Yarmuk alone, 22 Palestinians have been killed and more than 80 wounded in recent fighting with government forces. . . . The same thing is happening in the Palestinian camps in Haleb and Darah, also in Syria. Moreover, hundreds have been detained."

The Voice of the PLO from Baghdad is quite specific. It says that "the PLO holds Syrian President Hafez Al-Assad responsible for the bloody incidents".

162. I shall be happy to supply the numbers, because what is important is not only who is doing the accusing, but the numbers involved. Medical Aid for the Palestinians, a British-based charity whose sympathies are very clear, reported this summer, after a trip to Lebanon, that 14,000 Palestinian Arabs had fled the Syrian carnage to southern Lebanon. It is evidently much safer for Palestinians to be closer to Israel than to Syria and Damascus.

163. The representative of Syria evoked, by my count, at least a dozen times the word "democracy". What kind of democracy is he suggesting—the farcical parliaments of Damascus, perhaps democracy by what is known in our region by everyone—and by now, surely by the members of the Council—as democracy by Hama rules? He evoked other calls—and I was touched to hear them—about concern for Israeli democracy and its future by various Arab representatives. I am encouraged by that concern, because I hope it will translate into their own countries and into a new age that we can look forward to.

164. But I am most grateful to the Syrian representative for his quotation from Lincoln. To give another quotation from him, Lincoln once said: "Words fitly spoken are like apples of gold on a silver platter".

165. I do not wish to say that the Syrian representative's other text was a silver platter, but his quotations about the meaning of liberty and the commitment to liberty of the American Secretary of State and his statements about Israel's resolve to defend liberty are indeed apples of gold.

166. The question has arisen during the present discussions of what constitutes civilian targets. It is very easy to answer that. I cited a few yesterday: the cab driver, a young schoolteacher with his pupils or five children in the heart of Jerusalem who were stabbed. Those are civilian targets. The status of civilian targets is totally unaffected by the cause of the conflicts that are waged around them and claim them as victims. In fact, there would be no meaning to international law and the whole concept of the war Convention and the very ideas that this body—not only the Security Council but the United Nations—was set up for, if we did not adhere to the central tenet of the laws of war—that is, that the separation of combatants from non-combatants—and if such a definition were not entirely independent of the nature or cause, professed or real, of the conflicts involved.

167. Nothing justifies the deliberate murder of children. Nothing, not "national liberation", not fighting for "legitimate rights"—nothing. If we allow ourselves to become conditioned, horribly conditioned, to the idea that such terrorism, such violence, such systematic and deliberate killing of civilians, is permissible, not merely will those particular victims suffer, but it will open up the international arena for a period of lawlessness and a return to the savagery that we witnessed earlier in the century.

168. I asked yesterday how many deportations we were dealing with. The figure that I gave has not been challenged. The number was one expulsion of an active terrorist in the past four years. Some representatives, including the Syrian representative, said that "mass killings" of Palestinian Arabs were taking place right now. Mass killings, I suppose, by Hama rules would be, say, 20,000. That is the number of Syrian civilians killed in Hama. Take half of that—10,000: that would be mass killings. But I shall be lenient and say perhaps 1,000, perhaps 100: it is still a mass killing. I shall be more lenient—10. How about five? How about naming five Palestinian Arabs who have been killed—we can argue later about whether they were innocent or not—by Israeli forces in the past year? I shall be more lenient. How about fewer than five? I suggest we have the names of those people presented here. Just like yesterday's figure, today's challenge says it all.

169. We are dealing here not merely with the abuse of the Council and its convening for an absolutely preposterous and irrelevant reason, but with a distortion, because those very people who have been engaged in mass killings, in mass attacks, in the deliberate and systematic murder of the innocent, are usurping the purpose and meaning of this body, and it would be a terrible continuation of the degradation they seek to inflict on it if the draft resolution that they have presented were adopted.

170. The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it [*ibid.*]. Unless I hear an objection, I shall put it to the vote now.

171. I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

172. Mr. LOUET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to convey to you, Sir, the congratulations and encouragement of the French delegation on your assumption of the presidency. We are happy that in September the Security Council will be able to benefit from your experience and skills.

173. I would ask you to be good enough to express our thanks also to the representative of the Soviet Union for the remarkable way in which he carried out his task during August, a month in which he presided over the Council with authority and courtesy.

174. My Government has observed with great concern the new rise of tension in the West Bank and Gaza, which has led the administration of the occupying Power to revive special legislation dating from the time of the Mandate. One can only deplore the constraints which that legislation imposes on the civilian population of the occupied territories. Nevertheless, we must remain aware that only a cessation of the escalation of violence, from whatever source, will make it possible to restore the climate of confidence that is indispensable to dialogue.

175. You are aware of the particular interest that my Government has always taken in the situation of the peoples of these territories, both with regard to the protection of the persons and to the preservation of resources and respect for the structures of local representation. It is in that spirit that my country has always been committed to the defence of the legitimate rights of the peoples of the territories of the West Bank and Gaza, in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions, in particular the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] Accordingly, my delegation would have liked to be able to take a position on a text of a draft resolution clearly reflecting the situation with regard to the measures taken by the occupying administration since 4 August last *vis-à-vis* the stipulations of the Fourth Geneva Convention. That Convention clearly prohibits, in its article 49, deportations of persons outside the territories in question, and, in its article 78, subjects internment to precise conditions. There can be no doubt whatsoever that Israel, as the occupying Power, must respect the provisions of that Convention. According to information at our disposal, some of the measures recently taken by Israel in the occupied territories are not in fact in keeping with the provisions of that Convention. But the draft resolution before us suggests that all those measures are contrary to the Convention.

176. In those circumstances, my delegation feels it must abstain on the draft resolution.

177. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): First of all, I should like to express the thanks of my delegation for the able, indeed outstanding, manner in which you, Mr. President, have presided over the Security Council during the month of September, and to express our gratitude therefor.

178. I should like also to address to Mr. Troyanovsky our thanks for the businesslike, coherent and fair way in which he conducted the presidency last month. It is almost 30 years to the day since Ambassador Troyanovsky and I met in Geneva—in a distant, distant past when we were both a great deal younger.

179. I turn now to my statement in explanation of vote.

180. I must first point out that the confrontational debate we have witnessed yesterday and today has done little to serve the cause of peace. In our view, the often intemperate and unwarranted language used by many members to criticize Israel has tended only to distract and disrupt and to complicate the search for a just solution to the problems of the Middle East. It has been a matter of particular concern to us that this should be taking place when a process of peace is under way in the Middle East.

181. I have to note in particular a number of references here to the Nazis and nazism. One or another contemporary situation has been repeatedly described here as a form of nazism, as being analogous to the crimes of the Nazi period. This is patent nonsense. I can only appeal for an end to this sort of harmful, indeed poisonous, rhetoric.

182. It is particularly distressing to listen to rhetoric charging the United States Government with the "heinous crimes" of responding to public opinion in determining its foreign and domestic policies, helping to provide Israel with a sense of security and attempting to find a way to bring about a just and lasting peace between Israel and its neighbours. I had hoped to listen to and participate in a reasoned debate. I regret that, instead, I have heard the preaching of hate in this Chamber.

183. Coming now to the subject of this debate, let me say that I believe we have another problem here—namely, the selective application of the law. This is a phenomenon which, regrettably, is becoming ever more frequent in the Council and could well be the death knell of any system of law. Any system of law—and certainly that is what the United Nations aspires to be—has as its first rule the equal application of the law. This principle lies at the heart of the Charter of the United Nations. Universality is the very cornerstone of the United Nations. The unfortunate obsession of several States in the Council debate with the selective application of international conventions is destructive to the quest for world order as envisaged by the Charter. This cannot be allowed to continue. Either these conventions apply to all or they apply to none. Selective application of the Charter or international conventions strikes at the very heart of the institution. My Government will continue to oppose such destructive tendencies.

184. I was also grieved by the repeated accusations of hostility toward Palestinians made by those who choose to forget that my country has done more to support the Palestinians through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency since 1949 than any other country. As is well known, the United States is by far the largest contributor to UNRWA.

185. Let me turn now to the draft resolution before the Council [*ibid.*].

186. The United States Government cannot support a draft resolution which singles out for condemnation the detention and other policies of Israel on the West Bank and Gaza without equally condemning and calling for a halt to the acts of terror against Israeli civilians and officials in the West Bank and Gaza which have provoked those policies.

187. We have made clear in the past that we consider measures such as administrative detention and deportation to be inconsistent with the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2]

188. As we have stated repeatedly, the United States Government is very concerned about the level of violence throughout the area, including Lebanon and Israel. If left unchecked, this violence inevitably leads to a spiral of reprisals. All those truly interested in a just and lasting settlement in the region must work to break this vicious circle. One-sided draft resolutions such as this one, however, encourage the spiral of violence and retaliation by hardening the attitudes of all parties. The party singled out for condemnation naturally concludes it can never get a fair hearing, and the other parties believe that the Security Council has condoned their actions. I might add that there are unfortunately many other peoples in that region, in Central Asia, and in South-East Asia who live under foreign military occupation. Little consideration seems to be given to the plight of these millions who have been driven from their homes.

189. In conclusion, let me say that such a draft resolution as the one before us undercuts rather than strengthens the ability of this body to play a positive role in resolving the problems which are the root cause of the violence by exacerbating an already volatile situation.

190. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago, and contained in document S/17459.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

There were 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

191. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

192. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): I should like to associate the Australian delegation with the high praise that has been accorded to your diplomatic skills by previous speakers and to welcome you, Sir John, as President of the Council for the month of September.

193. I should like also to record my delegation's warm appreciation of the skilful way in which the representative of the Soviet Union discharged his duties as President during the month of August.

194. The Australian delegation abstained in the vote. In considering the draft resolution we have taken into account all the statements made to the Council in these two meetings and our understanding of the situation on the ground in the occupied territories. What is clear to us is the increasing unrest on the West Bank with violence breeding violence, often to the detriment of innocent civilians. Of particular regret to my delegation are the graphic and sad accounts of attacks on innocent women and children, attacks that we find outrageous and repugnant.

195. In approaching the issue before the Council, my delegation has been guided by a number of considerations. We cannot do otherwise but note that the persistence of problems of this sort reinforces the continuing need for a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East. In the present case, we regard Israel's continued occupation of the occupied territories as being in breach of international law. Equally, while the occupation continues there can be no doubt as to the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] to those occupied territories. Israel has understandable security concerns, but it has an obligation to respect the civil liberties of the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank and to refrain from excessive measures. There may be debate as to what constitutes a breach of the Geneva Convention, but it is important that the acts of the occupier conform to the letter and spirit of the provisions of that Convention.

196. The facts of the situation in the West Bank speak for themselves. Much has been said here about causes and effects and blame has been directed at different parties. What is clear is that action has bred reaction in a cycle of violence. The result has been a series of events all too familiar, but none the less distressing, to members of the Council. It is the hope of the Australian delegation that we shall see, first, an early end to violence and, secondly, a restoration of calm and peace in the occupied territories.

197. My delegation regrets that the draft resolution before the Council was deficient in several respects. We would have preferred to see a recognition in it of the regrettable escalation of violence in the occupied territories rather than a focus solely on the actions of one party. Similarly, the draft resolution in our view contains unbalanced and, in some cases, less than fully accurate reflections of the situation on the ground in its relationship to the Geneva Convention. It is for those reasons that my delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution before us.

198. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): Let me start, Sir, by saying how pleased we are to see you presiding over the Council for the month of September. We have worked together closely on many occasions, both in the past and in the course of our membership of the Council, and we highly appreciate your professional and human qualities.

199. I should like also to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky, for the way in which he carried out his duties as President for the month of August. Once again my delegation had the opportunity to admire his qualities as a diplomat and to appreciate his fairness and sense of humour.

200. Denmark is very concerned about the latest developments in the Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967. The increasing number of attacks on Israeli civilians has led to a series of Israeli countermeasures, including administrative detentions, curfews and deportation orders.

201. My Government strongly deplores this escalation of violence and tension, which has resulted in a number of innocent civilian victims, and urges all parties to show the utmost restraint. We should like to reaffirm that the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] as well as other norms of international law, are applicable to the occupied territories until such time as an end is put, within the framework of a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement, to the territorial occupation which Israel has maintained since 1967.

202. Denmark, together with the other members of the European Community, has on several occasions stated its position regarding the Israeli policies in these territories and the principles necessary to secure peace in the Middle East. A continuation of the cycle of violence and countermeasures can only undermine the necessary basis of dialogue and trust which is an essential prerequisite for any constructive negotiations aimed at achieving a comprehensive peace settlement. Denmark therefore urges that no steps be taken that could lead to further aggravation of tension in the area.

203. The draft resolution presented today did not adequately take these considerations into account. Furthermore, we fear that it might have hampered the moves towards negotiations on the Arab-Israeli conflict. Consequently, my delegation abstained in the vote.

204. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Sir, we are happy to see you here as President and we feel that the affairs of the Council are in good hands. We wish you all success in this important month when, among other things, we shall hold a commemorative session of the Security Council with Ministers for Foreign Affairs participating.

205. I also welcome the new representatives of China and Peru and wish them success in their important work.

206. The Soviet Union voted for the draft resolution submitted by the group of non-aligned States members of the Security Council. We express regret that it was not adopted because of another veto by the United States. None the less, we feel that Qatar, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, had every justification for requesting that the Security Council convene immediately to consider the question of the repressive measures of the Israeli authorities against the Arab Palestinian population of the occupied territories.

207. The dangerous situation created as a result of these repressive measures can be seen from the statements of the observer for the PLO, the representatives of the Arab countries and members of the Council at yesterday's and today's meetings. Moreover, we would like to stress that we reject any attempt to equate the occupiers with the inhabitants of the territories who are resisting occupation. We feel that any talk of a "cycle of violence" is quite out of place in this situation.

208. The Council knows that the Israeli authorities have established conditions of terror in the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip: the occupiers open fire on defenceless Palestinians and mass arrests are being carried out in accordance with the 4 August law on administrative detention. In a number of cities curfews have been imposed and many Palestinians are threatened with deportation. The fact that these actions are a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and of resolutions of the Council can be doubted by no one. Nor can anyone doubt that Israel's actions and its ignoring of Security Council decisions are possible strictly because of the direct economic, military, political and diplomatic help and support received from its strategic partner. Today we have seen yet another example of that support.

209. The Soviet delegation confirms its unswerving policy on the question of the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. We express our solidarity with the courageous struggle of the Palestinian people for their legitimate national rights and the establishment of an independent State. A comprehensive Middle East settlement can be achieved only through the collective efforts of all the parties concerned, including the PLO, within the framework of a specially convened international conference on the Middle East.

210. In vigorously condemning Israel's recent repressive acts against Palestinians in the occupied territories the delegation of the Soviet Union feels that it is high time for the Council to take the strictest measures to put an end to such activities.

211. The PRESIDENT: Before I speak in my capacity as the representative of the United Kingdom, I should like to say one or two things.

212. I feel somewhat at a disadvantage: Since I have already formally congratulated and thanked my predecessor on behalf of the whole Council and also welcomed the representatives of China and Peru, I am left without any

nice little introduction to my statement. But I do have something serious to say.

213. I hope that all extreme or abusive statements will be avoided. They are not consistent with the standing and dignity of the Council. In particular, they should be avoided by representatives of non-members who are guests of the Council.

214. I now wish to make a statement in my national capacity in explanation of vote.

215. My delegation listened with close attention to the arguments put forward in the course of the debate. We also took account of reports from the occupied territories of violent incidents and of measures taken by the authorities. We deplore the acts of violence by whomsoever committed, especially when these cost innocent civilian lives. We feel grave concern for the damage done to the atmosphere of calm and restraint which is essential for the success of current efforts to engage all parties in peace negotiations, to which we attach the greatest importance.

216. We cannot ignore the fact that a number of the measures taken by the Israeli authorities in the occupied territories appear to have been extreme and to have been taken in breach of their legal obligations. The Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] imposes clear obligations upon the occupying Power in its conduct towards the civilian population of the territory. There can be no doubt that deportation of even a single individual would be in breach of the provisions of article 49 of the Convention and, therefore, wholly unacceptable. Nor do we believe that the Israeli authorities have acted with all the sensitivity that is clearly required in the tense and unhappy circumstances prevailing in the occupied territories.

217. My delegation considered carefully the draft resolution submitted by a number of member States of the Council in document S/17459. As some members are aware, we indicated that a number of points of difficulty arose for us in its formulations. Despite our unhappiness about certain aspects of the conduct of the Israeli authorities, we were not satisfied that paragraph 2 conformed with the occupying Power's legal obligations in this case, and we would have welcomed a balanced reference calling for an end to violence by all parties. Only if calm is restored to the West Bank will it be possible to move the peace process forward. We regret that suggestions on these lines were not taken up and we have therefore found it necessary to abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

218. I now resume my function as President of the Security Council. The representative of Qatar has asked to be allowed to speak, and I call on him.

219. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): On the occasion of the conclusion of the Council's proceedings on the repressive measures taken by the Israelis against the Palestinians in occupied Arab territories, I should like to make the following points in my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States.

220. I express our sincerest thanks and appreciation to the non-aligned States members of the Council for their efforts in preparing a draft resolution that reflected the minimum aspirations of the civilian population in the Palestinian territories to put an end to the inhuman practices pursued by the Zionist authorities against them.

221. I express the same thanks and appreciation to all those States that voted in favour of the draft resolution. Their affirmative votes reflect their commitment to humanitarian principles and equality among all peoples, as well as the fact that they have expressed their concern for all individuals without any discrimination.

222. I am confident that the Palestinian people will not forget this honourable position and will consider it as support in its efforts to end the occupation. The Group of Arab States, for its part, expresses its appreciation to them for their positive response to Arab demands and will not forget their position.

223. We regret that some States have abstained in the vote. We had hoped that those States, some of which have suffered from foreign occupation and whose peoples have struggled with all courage against the occupiers, would understand the reality of the situation faced by the Palestinian people and the feelings and reasons behind the Palestinian struggle to end that occupation. We had hoped that the history and heritage of those countries would impel them to vote in favour of that draft resolution.

224. We especially regret that the United States has by its veto defeated the draft resolution. We had hoped that the United States, which takes a pioneering role against colonialism and occupation—which supports human rights and self-determination for all peoples—principles enshrined in the Fourteen Points proclaimed by President Wilson—would not ignore the rights of the Palestinian people. We had hoped that it would not ignore the most basic human aspirations of the Palestinian people, particularly since the draft resolution was very mild in form and in content.

225. Legally and technically, the draft resolution has failed because of the use of the veto. Morally, however, the draft resolution has given support to our brothers in the occupied Arab territories in their struggle to rid themselves of injustice and heinous occupation.

226. The PRESIDENT: The observer for the PLO has asked to speak. I call on him.

227. Mr. MANSOUR (Palestine Liberation Organization) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset I should like, on behalf of the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinians, wherever they are, to convey our thanks to all our friends who voted in favour of the draft

resolution, despite all odds. They thus affirmed their condemnation of the repressive measures pursued by the Israeli authorities against our struggling people in the Arab territories. They also affirmed their solidarity with our own people in its just, legitimate struggle against this obnoxious occupation. We take deep gratification from the wide support of the non-aligned and socialist States and our friends who affirmed today that they are on the side of right, justice and the struggle of people against colonialism, oppression, occupation and aggression.

228. Israel believes that mankind in general is in the wrong and that people are liars. Israel believes that it and the United States are the only countries that do not lie. Anyway, I shall leave it to the Council to understand the lies and inventions of the Israeli representatives.

229. The position of the United States, which killed the draft resolution, as it previously killed the declaration by the President of the Security Council, automatically stands in the way of any measure taken by this Council on the subject. It is yet another practice in a long list of practices pursued by the United States against the aspirations of the Palestinian people.

230. This position of the United States goes against the minimum standard of human rights because it supports the oppression and the iron-fist policy pursued by Israel. It ignores the most basic human right of the Palestinian people: the right to stand up to aggression. This disastrous veto cast by the United States is yet another challenge to the international will and the will to halt the illegal practices pursued by Israel against the people of Palestine.

231. The representative of the United States said that the United States has helped the Palestinian people. He ignored the fact that the United States was behind the problem of the Palestinians and has opposed the Palestinians' return to their homeland. The return of the Palestinian people is still being opposed by Israel and the United States, especially the United States, which prevents the adoption of any resolution by the Council. Moreover, Israel and the United States are impeding the implementation of relevant United Nations resolutions.

232. Everyone knows who is hindering the attainment of peace in the Middle East. To be hypocritical and yet condemn hypocrisy is the worst form of hypocricy. The position of the United States will encourage our people to go in only one direction: to step up its struggle and end the occupation of our territory. We insist on regaining our territory and establishing an independent State on our own soil, Palestine.

233. As for the lies on the part of the Zionist representative today and yesterday, and his attack against the Palestinian people in its struggle in the occupied territories, I should like to tell him about some of the opinions in the Israeli press. The Israeli representative believes that anything else is just a lie, a fabrication and invention. He may be convinced by what is being said in the Zionist press and written by Zionist writers.

234. The Israeli newspaper *Davar* likened the Palestinian struggle to a natural law. It said: "So long as there is occupation there will be constant revolution."

235. When an Israeli newspaper like *Davar* admits that fact and devotes to it its editorial of 20 August, it sends an obvious message to the supporters of "the iron fist policy, the policy of oppression, the policy of besieging Palestinian camps and villages". The purport of this message is that "that policy might bring about a certain calm, but the next wave of resistance will inevitably come; it cannot be prevented". The editorial called upon the Israelis to dispel the illusions harboured by those in power who attempt to halt the efforts of those struggling against the occupation, and also said that "he who believes that the practices of the occupation authorities can stop protest against the Israeli authorities is deluding himself".

236. Anyone observing the prevailing situation in the occupied territories in the light of the official terrorism against Palestinian citizens may have an opinion contrary to that of the masterminds of Zionist policy, because that policy cannot dissuade the Palestinians from resistance.

237. The newspaper went on to say that:

> "It is high time that the Israeli Government stop arm-twisting, flexing its muscles and offering deceptive promises that the blood of Jews will not be split in vain. Why do we not speak the truth and say that there can be no secure life for the Jews"—referring, of course, to the Jews on the West Bank and in Gaza—"if more than a million people look upon us as occupiers. Even if we take away their knives, razors and stones, they will still have their fists, nails and teeth to resist with."

238. I quote again from the newspaper *Ha'aretz* of 7 August, which said:

> "The outbreak of a fire within means success for Arafat. We have to admit unequivocally that the inevitable result of all the oppression will be a very harmful one, particularly since confusion and disillusionment will be sown among the Jewish population, which will alter the direction and shape of life even within the green-line area and administer a shock to our society."

239. If our people's resistance to occupation in the occupied territories amounts to mere acts of terrorism by a handful of people, as was alleged by the representative of Israel, why, then, do they send paratroops to the Palestinian territories? Why do they increase their oppression against the inhabitants of the occupied territories? Why have they persisted in enforcing inhuman laws against them since 4 August 1985? Why do they continue administrative arrests by the hundreds? Why do they deport trade unionists workers, students and heads of municipalities who spent long periods in prison and were freed under agreements with the International Red Cross? Why were they expelled after having spent month after month among their people, as was determined by yesterday's Supreme Court decision to expel 11 Palestinians from the

occupied territories? They could be expelled at any moment—if they have not already been. Why do they open fire on children? Why do they build new prisons? Why do they close down and muzzle the press? Why do they impose curfews? Why do they practice mass persecution? Why do they confiscate land and establish more settlements? Why do they condone some people—especially Kahane and Sharon—who want to eject 2 million Arabs? I put all those questions before the Council.

240. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

241. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): I thank you, Mr. President, for inviting me to speak again, "to exercise the right of reply". My understanding is, Sir, that in your capacity as President of the Council, you probably did not have the right to make that comment about my statement; and as to your national capacity I think that your comment, since I did not say anything against your country, might not have been necessary. But still I am exercising my right of reply.

242. Regarding the substance of your comment, Sir, I say that we are a signatory to the Charter of the United Nations not for the fun of it, but in order to see that the Charter is implemented. I wonder if any member of the Council believes that the Council has been able fully and correctly to defend the rights of the Palestinians or that the struggles of the Council in that direction have not been obstructed. Our problem, Mr. President, is the same as yours: we too want the implementation of the Charter and of the resolutions of the Council.

243. But consistent implementation of the Charter requires respect for the Charter both today and at the time when the land of Palestine was first occupied and divided, with one part of it gradually eroded and nibbled at, which is the case to this day. We all know where we are today: it is the revered Charter itself which has not been able to defend the rights of the Palestinian people, or the rights of the Moslems whose sanctuaries are now occupied by the Zionist forces.

244. We therefore believe that the Charter has, in very polite terms, not been implemented. We believe that this politeness and lack of implementation will continue.

245. I should also say, Sir, without making any comment regarding the substance of the Malvinas war—and I believe you will agree with me—that your country conducted that war under the title of self-defence. Your country believed it was a legitimate war.

246. Similarly, I believe that if the Moslem world unites in defence of Palestine and against the Zionist usurpers that is quite legitimate under the Charter, and none of its signatories will be in contravention of the terms of membership of the United Nations. Therefore, I am glad that the call for the defence of Palestine, the very comprehensive call, the Islamic call, still falls within the terms of the Charter.

247. I regret that some may have been displeased by that call. The fact is that my statement, the statement of a guest of the Security Council, was not abusive at all. It was full of facts, but facts are not always sweet. They are sometimes very bitter. The facts that are taking place now inside Palestine and Lebanon and elsewhere in the Moslem world are very bitter. The occupation of Palestine, the killing of people, their dislocation, their being led to where they are now, are very bitter facts; they are not sweet. We must however see them as they are.

248. We also know that the occupation of Palestine and the violation of the rights of the Palestinians have been tolerated very politely in this chamber. I believe that the bitter facts about those violations and usurpations deserve the same treatment.

249. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

250. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I apologize to members of the Council for speaking at such a late hour, but I shall be very brief.

251. At the outset, I wish to express my country's thanks to Burkina Faso, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Madagascar and India for their position of principle on such a vital issue, the protection of the structure of international human law by obliging countries that are occupying others to respect international law. That position shows care not only for international law but for the Charter of the United Nations, which was adopted after the Second World War because of the Fascist and Nazi practices to which millions fell victim in Europe.

252. The vote on the draft resolution made one thing clear, particularly to all the Arab countries which, represented by the representative of Qatar, came here to request what was their right, not to beg anything of the Council. If the United States veto of another draft resolution put forward to save those persecuted under occupation in Lebanon and elsewhere showed anything, it was its intention to abolish or destroy international law because it applies to the American aggression against the people of Nicaragua.

253. There are attempts to falsify the description "freedom fighters". The United States Central Intelligence Agency is working in Nicaragua. Officials at the highest levels of the United States Administration are formally calling the rebels there popular or national liberation movements. However, our sons in Palestine, South Lebanon and other occupied Arab territories are exiled, shot, detained and imprisoned, and we are told that we have no right to resort to the Security Council with a resolution that can include only one party, as if we were on the same level as the Israelis; the usurpers and the occupied are on the same level.

254. The majority of members of the Council have been under foreign occupation at some time. We can see this from European literature and the history of the Orient and the West. Books published after the Second World War show that resistance is the most honourable act of a human being. I take pride that we have people struggling in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, South Lebanon and the Golan Heights. I have said before that we cherish and honour them, and the international community must support their struggle to liberate their territories.

255. The right to wage that struggle is enshrined in the Charter. It is a tradition that has been followed since the foundation of the United Nations and since the adoption of the resolution to end colonization. It is just like the right given in Article 51 of the Charter. The struggle is legitimate. All countries under occupation are obliged to use that right to liberate their territories. Therefore, no matter how the United States may try to equate us with the Israelis imported from various parts of the world, we shall never listen to the United States. We shall never heed its threats and we shall never yield an inch. We shall come to the Security Council dozens of times, knowing in advance that we shall face the American veto, because we know the United States is protecting Israel.

256. Israel signed the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[2] So far it has not recognized the applicability of the Convention to all Arab territories, but it selects those provisions that benefit its occupation forces while denying those that protect the civilian population under occupation.

257. We have more than once said that what we are trying to tell the Council is that there is an alliance between the United States and Israel and a conspiracy against the Arab nation, particularly in that region of the Middle East.

258. There has been talk about democracy. We talk about Israeli democracy, that racist democracy. Of course the Zionists have democracy; they have the right to vote. The white minority in South Africa has the right to vote, but the black majority does not have that right. The two situations are very similar. The Arabs in so-called Israel do not have the rights given to the Israelis. In order not to prolong the discussion, I shall not give examples.

259. The freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution seems to apply only to those who praise and applaud Israel. I shall give a very small example in this connection. It relates to a professor at the State University at Stony Brook in Long Island. I quote the following excerpt from an article in *The New York Times* on 18 August:

> "[This professor] who was involved in a controversy two years ago because a course he taught equated Zionism with racism has been denied tenure and will have to leave the University next year.
>
> " . . .
>
> "There were no objections to his teaching until a visiting Israeli professor complained, in a 1983 letter to the administration, that Professor Dube's linking of Zionism to racism was 'sloganeering that is practised by the anti-Semite'.
>
> "The Israeli professor, Selwyn K. Troen, said he had never talked with Professor Dube nor attended his classes, but based his charge on a complaint by one student and by the course syllabus."

And here is the syllabus:

> "Fifth week: the three forms of racism and how they have manifested themselves. 1. Nazism in Germany. 2. *Apartheid* in South Africa. 3. Zionism in Israel."*

260. The fate meted out to that professor was expulsion from the university. The claim is made that in the United States academic freedom is guaranteed. But because that professor dared to speak freely and honestly and to say what we have said in the General Assembly—namely, that Zionism is racism—he was expelled. This is freedom and democracy in the United States.

261. The representative of the enemy asked for the name of a Palestinian who was killed last year, or during the last two years. But all of us read the newspapers. We know that a large number of persons have been killed; I am not saying that thousands have been killed, but there have been a large number. The Israeli representative used the phrase "in the past year". But he forgot about the destruction and killing that have taken place since 1948.

262. Through you, Mr. President, we should like to ask the Israeli representative this: Who killed Count Folke Bernadotte, the representative of the Secretary-General in Palestine? Shamir, now the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel. Does that not constitute killing? Shamir killed Count Folke Bernadotte and his French colleague.

263. Through you, Mr. President, we ask the Israeli representative this: Who killed 300 innocent civilians in Deir Yassin? Who was the champion of that massacre? Well, the champion of that massacre was crowned with the Nobel prize. He became a Nobel prize laureate. The Nobel prize is not an Arab prize. Everyone knows the background of the prize. And who perpetrated the massacre in Deir Yassin? Begin, who went to Cairo and who was visited by Sadat. Begin, who was awarded the Nobel prize. And who perpetrated the massacre at Qibya? It was Sharon, the same person who perpetrated the massacre of Beirut; the same person who masterminded the plan for the invasion of Lebanon, in which 30,000 Lebanese have been killed and which has left tens of thousands of other victims.

264. And the Israeli representative asks when did they kill people, when did they beat them, when did they expel

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

them? Perhaps Israel has not expelled or exiled anyone in the past month or the past two or six months, but in 1948 Israel expelled and exiled about a million Palestinians.

265. Article 49 of the Fourth Geneva Convention, which the representative of Israel has falsely invoked, states very clearly in its second paragraph:

> "Persons thus evacuated shall be transferred back to their homes as soon as hostilities in the area in question have ceased."*

266. The number of refugees has become larger and larger as children have been born. The number has tripled. Each year the United Nations states that these refugees must be allowed to return. The United States representative reminds the Council of the assistance given by his Government to UNRWA. What they are saying to the Palestinians is this: "If you remain outside your territory, we will give you some dollars, but you must never invoke the right to return".

267. Israel has expelled 128,000 persons from the Golan Heights. It has displaced tens of thousands of families in southern Lebanon. Yet the Israeli representative asks when did they touch an Arab, when did they expel an Arab, when did they exile an Arab? There are really limits to this kind of falsification.

268. I am very miserable about the result of the vote on this humanitarian draft resolution. We remind you that the entire world is standing by the people of South Africa. But Israel is collaborating with the South African régime. In this connection I should like to quote from an article in the *Economist*—a publication from your own country, the United Kingdom.

> "Yet Israeli-South African relations, especially military ones, are the closest of all. A host of joint research projects bind the countries together. For instance, South African steel has helped to give the Merkava an extra-strong armour-plating; South Africa now makes its own version of the Kfir. A joint submarine-building project is under way; and—most sensitive of all—South African uranium . . . is thought to have been used to develop Israel's capacity for making a nuclear bomb."*

269. These questions must be posed, must be thought out and must be directed to the representative of Israel, who is in this Chamber.

270. The PRESIDENT: The Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.

---

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/40/1).

[2] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973.

[3] *Ibid.*, vol. 1125, No. 17512.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00400 90-61439—January 1995—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2606th MEETING: 20 SEPTEMBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2606)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa:	
Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2606th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 20 September 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2606)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)

1. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Angola, Argentina, Brazil, Cyprus, Guyana, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Zambia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), took a place at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, which reads as follows:

> "I have the honour to request the Security Council to permit me to participate in my capacity as Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*, under the provisions of rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, in the consideration of the item 'Complaint by Angola against South Africa'."

On previous occasions the Council has extended invitations to representatives of other United Nations bodies in connection with the consideration of matters on its agenda. In accordance with past practice in this matter, I propose that the Council extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*.

It was so decided.

3. The PRESIDENT: The Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 19 September 1985 from the representative of Angola to the President of the Security Council [*S/17474*].

4. I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to the following other documents: S/17472, containing a letter dated 18 September 1985 from the representative of Angola to the President of the Council; S/17475, containing a letter dated 18 September from the representative of Brazil to the Secretary-General; S/17480, containing a letter dated 19 September from the representative of Botswana to the Secretary-General.

5. The first speaker is the representative of Angola, upon whom I now call.

6. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of September. I also wish to thank you for your assistance in convening a meeting of the Council, especially since this is a very hectic period for everyone connected with the United Nations. I also thank the Secretary-General for his efforts and the personal interest he has always taken in my country.

7. This is a time of rejoicing for the United Nations, a time for taking stock of the past 40 years, a time which will witness in the coming days and weeks one of the largest attendances of heads of State or Government, a time when the makers of history gather at the epicentre of internation-

alism, a time when chroniclers will record and historians judge the events of this period.

8. For the past months, countries in different parts of the globe, peoples of different colours, creeds and systems have observed or participated in national or regional activities relating to the glorious fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. And in the next few days and weeks, the attention of the world will focus on United Nations Headquarters as the Organization proudly commemorates the four decades of its existence. This sense of excitement, of renewed hope and quickening of the senses, is almost palpable, even in the corridors of this building and outside it, as the VIPs arrive and depart. A possible summit between the United States and the Soviet Union is a matter of intense debate, and even blasé, cosmopolitan New York City and its people are caught up in the moment. The friends of the United Nations are celebrating, and its critics are almost silent. It is a good time to be alive, to be in New York, and especially to be at the United Nations.

9. But there is a place where there is no celebration and no rejoicing. It is a place under attack, under siege, under bombardment by air and by land, a wrecked place where today's reality is war, death and destruction, a place where the United Nations celebration of 40 years of peace is a mockery, an event which would be satirical if the situation in which southern Angola finds itself were not so tragic.

10. On 16 September, the murderous armed forces of South Africa yet again launched a massive invasion of the People's Republic of Angola. What a tribute to the fortieth session of the United Nations!

11. The South African armed forces unleashed a new major attack on 17 September, with massive air raids and attacks on Angolan military units in the provinces of Cunene, Cuando-Cubango and Moxico, 275 kilometres from the border with Namibia. The racist attack was directed against FAPLA (*People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*) units, which were advancing towards the UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) base at Jamba from Mavinga, in the province of Cuando-Cubango, 255 kilometres north of the Namibian border and 180 kilometres from the border with Zambia.

12. On 19 September, South African Mirage jets raided the Mavinga area, and at present not only are the South African racists bombarding and raiding Angolan territory but they are also getting ready for more direct confrontation, on Angolan soil, with Angolan troops in the province of Cuando-Cubango, in the face of UNITA's inability to stop the FAPLA advance. Today's headline says, "Peace isn't Pretoria's top priority". The infamous Buffalo Battalion, made up of mercenaries from former Rhodesia and equipped with armoured vehicles, artillery and mortars, and also cars and other transport, entered into action with the brave FAPLA units. The Buffalo Battalion is aided by five additional South African battalions. Vast quantities of arms, weapons and other military equipment have been air-dropped by the racist régime in the Cazombo area, in the east of Angola.

13. There are no SWAPO (*South West Africa People's Organization*) bases in Cuando-Cubango and Moxico. These racist actions are intended exclusively to save UNITA puppets, who are unable to survive or have any type of military or political existence without the racist régime of South Africa. And the South African invasion has taken place just a short time after the South African régime sent a letter to my Government containing both threats and a proposal for a dialogue on the situation in the region. As my Government was considering a response, the racists sabotaged all prospects by their clandestine attack on the American Gulf Oil installation at Malongo, in the province of Cabinda.

14. The international community is surely not taken in by South Africa's weak and pathetic attempts to portray this massive invasion of my country as a pre-emptive strike against freedom fighters of SWAPO or as a follow-up operation to purported SWAPO attempts. These ridiculous explanations and pathetic justifications by the racist Pretoria régime would also be funny if they were not so tragic in their consequences.

15. It is a matter for some gratification that some of Pretoria's friends have deserted the racists; others have distanced themselves or fallen silent. A few have even come out strongly, officially and publicly, against the policies and actions of the Pretoria *apartheid* régime.

16. South Africa's rulers are today at war with their fellow South African. The foundations of *apartheid* are beginning to rock, and the ramparts are being scaled. South Africa is aflame with the fury of its people over a foreign, imported, imposed, artificial structure alien to the land and its people. South Africa is burning with the blood, anger and opposition of its people to a system they have never accepted and whose presence they will no longer tolerate.

17. Here one sees, lucidly and in sharp focus, the two aspects of *apartheid*—the internal oppression, repression and denial of human rights, the *apartheid* State's terrorism unleashed upon its own people, within its own borders; and Pretoria's outrageous military attack on the territory and the people of Angola, part of a pattern of similar earlier attacks and acts of aggression against Angola, Mozambique and Botswana—the external manifestation of that same *apartheid* ideology and practices, the *apartheid* State's terrorism unleashed outwards upon the sovereign States and peoples of neighbouring States.

18. It is vital that the Council and the international community see this link between the national and regional aspects of *apartheid*, the link between the pass laws of South Africa and the deaths of Angolan civilians hundreds of kilometres away across two international borders, the link between the disenfranchisement of South Africa's majority inhabitants and the sabotage of railroads, destruction of bridges and ports in Angola and Mozambique, the link between the high death rate of South Africa's black babies, the exploitation of black labour, the creation of the abominable homelands and the illegal occupation of Namibia and the destabilization attempts against

the sovereign, legitimate Governments in the region. These are all the manifestations of *apartheid*, as it originally sought to entrench itself and grow, and now, as it desperately seeks to survive in an increasingly hostile world.

19. On 26 September the members of the Council will hold their own commemorative session of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations—as well they may, being the "heart" of the United Nations machinery. At that meeting next week, will the Council take another close look at South Africa's record? This would be a fitting task and an opportune moment, since it is the Council that is charged with monitoring international peace and security and with admitting or expelling Member States.

20. South Africa was one of the original Members of the United Nations, one of those august few which signed the Charter of the United Nations in June 1945 at San Francisco. And it is South Africa which is today in contravention of many of the articles of the Charter. These violations are a matter of record, the subject of countless resolutions, including those of the Security Council itself. I will not impose on the Council the number and details of those articles of the Charter which Pretoria is guilty of contravening. Article 25 specifically states that "The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council". But may I be so bold as to suggest that, despite Article 30, which states that "The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure", that is, it is master of its own rules, the Council is in violation of Article 24 of the Charter. Article 24 specifically confers on the Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and provides that, in discharging these duties, the Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Those purposes and principles are among modern man's most lofty ideals—and I quote Article 1 of the Charter:

> "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

What meaning do these words have for the dead and dying in Angola?

21. I say this in sorrow and in frustration. It gives me no joy to make these charges. But my country, my people, have a duty to themselves to protect their sovereignty and territorial integrity, to protect the rights of our people, to further peace in the region.

22. Where else shall we turn for justice, for redress, for compensation? And yet the one organ designed and created expressly for such situations has been largely blind to Angola's pain and deaf to Angola's cries. The source of so much tension and danger in southern Africa has escaped with impunity, beyond a symbolic expulsion from the General Assembly.

23. At this meeting the issue on trial is not simply the acts of aggression committed against Angola; it is *apartheid* which is under indictment. Your votes will be votes for or against *apartheid*; the implementation of your decision, in the form of a resolution, will affect *apartheid* in southern Africa, not just in the Republic of South Africa.

24. Now, on the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the Council can show in a concrete manner what the United Nations is all about, and that the world is a better place because of the creation of the United Nations. Otherwise, our people in Angola might as well be in the middle of the third world war.

25. To those who have given their lives for Angola and who are even now facing South African guns, I have a duty to demand, as representative of a State Member of the United Nations, in good standing with the Organization and the international community, that the Security Council strongly condemn South Africa for its act of aggression, that it demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the racist armed forces from Angolan territory, that it adopt measures for the implementation of its resolutions on the question of South African aggression against Angola and that, in the face of Pretoria's continued violations of these resolutions, the Council consider punitive measures against South Africa, including action under Chapter VII of the Charter and expulsion from the Organization. Is it not time that the Council take action to restore meaning to the Charter and authority to itself?

26. As a State Member of the Organization, my country appeals to the Council, under all the relevant articles of the Charter, to come to our assistance. The continuation of circumstances such as those at present may leave us no option except recourse to Article 51 of the Charter, a right enshrined in the "constitution" of the United Nations itself.

27. The struggle continues. Victory is certain!

28. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

29. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): On behalf of the South African delegation, I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month.

30. Permit me to inform the Security Council of the circumstances leading to the situation that is currently obtaining in southern Angola.

31. In terms of the agreement reached between South Africa and Angola at Lusaka on 16 February 1984, South Africa undertook to disengage all its forces from the area which they had occupied in southern Angola on the understanding that the Angolan side would restrain SWAPO as the disengagement process proceeded, and would ensure that no SWAPO terrorists or Cuban forces would enter the territory from which the South African forces had withdrawn. The Angolan Government did not carry out this commitment. The territory was repeatedly violated by SWAPO terrorists moving southward to attack the civilian

population of South West Africa/Namibia. It is to no avail for Angola to dispute these facts. At sessions of the South African/Angolan Joint Monitoring Commission, these violations, 145 in all, were brought to the attention of the Angolan side, which admitted its inability to live up to both the letter and the spirit of the Lusaka understanding.

32. Nevertheless, in an effort to normalize the situation in that troubled part of the southern African region, South Africa announced on 18 April 1985 that it had completed the disengagement of its forces in terms of the Lusaka agreement in good faith. In order to stabilize the situation on the border, South Africa explored the possibility of establishing some form of joint South African/Angolan peace-keeping mechanism. Angola, however, refused to co-operate in any such venture. South Africa made it clear at the time that it would continue to take whatever action might be necessary to defend the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia against SWAPO's terror campaign.

33. Since the disengagement of South Africa's forces from Angola, SWAPO forces have returned to the southern Angola border area in ever-larger numbers and have announced their intention of increasing their attacks on civilian targets in South West Africa/Namibia. Despite repeated warnings to SWAPO, as well as appeals to the Angolan Government to control SWAPO's actions, there had been an increasing flow of evidence that SWAPO was intent on staging some major terrorist operation. Evidence of this was, for instance, the discovery of 124 kilograms of explosives at Katatura, near Windhoek, and a further 106 kilograms of explosives in the operational area, destined for use in South West Africa/Namibia.

34. More detailed information was obtained from two terrorists of SWAPO's Eighth Battalion, who, after their arrest, admitted that they were part of a reconnaissance and sabotage team. On the basis of their information, the tracks of at least 30 of these terrorists were followed to the border with Angola. A follow-up operation was immediately put into effect in southern Angola, where further large arms caches for use in South West Africa/Namibia were found and destroyed. The Angolan armed forces were advised throughout of the South African operation. The Chief of the South African Defence Force announced yesterday that the contingents involved in this operation have already been ordered to commence their withdrawal.

35. Regardless of the serious differences which have arisen between our countries, the South African Government remains willing to enter into serious and meaningful discussions with the Angolan Government as soon as possible. It considers such a dialogue to be an essential requirement for the peaceful and lasting resolution of the problems of our region, and particularly the volatile situation which obtains on the border between Angola and South West Africa/Namibia.

36. South Africa's action against SWAPO elements in southern Africa is, however, overshadowed by other developments in Angola. The central facts of the situation in Angola have not changed since the Council met last on this question. The fact is that in 1975 the MPLA (*People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola*) overturned the Alvor Agreement and deprived the people of Angola of their right to determine their own future in free and fair elections, which were to have been held before the end of October 1975. By so doing it unleashed the civil war which has wracked the people of Angola ever since.

37. South Africa has repeatedly stated that the problems of Angola should be solved by the people of Angola themselves. It has repeatedly called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Angola. It believes that there should be no foreign interference from any quarter in the affairs of Angola.

38. But at this very moment the Soviet Union and the Cubans are directing one of their greatest-ever offensives against the Angolan people. Soviet and Cuban combat elements are directly involved in the fighting, and some of them have been killed or wounded. Soviet advisers have been allocated to each of the FAPLA brigades to direct the overall strategy of the campaign. They and their Cuban surrogates have deployed the most modern weapons against the Angolan people, including MIG-23 and SU-22 aircraft, M-24 and M-25 helicopters and T-62 tanks. Nevertheless, the people of Angola are resisting the offensive courageously.

39. The front line of freedom in the world today is in the savannah and forests of Angola. The question which will be decided there is whether or not a new form of imperialism will be permitted to take root in Africa, 100 years after the Congress of Berlin. Does anyone really believe that once the Soviets and the Cubans have consolidated their position in Angola they will allow themselves to be removed? Does anyone imagine that they will not then use Angola as a base from which to subvert the rest of central, west and southern Africa? Those who have any doubts in this regard should study the Brezhnev doctrine again and ask the peoples of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cuba and Eastern Europe for their opinion.

40. Where does the Organization find itself in this conflict? Does its concern for self-determination, free elections and human rights stop short at the southern banks of the Cunene River? Is it prepared to stand idly by while the Soviets and the Cubans extinguish the right of the people of Angola to true independence and self-determination?

41. It was on 27 January 1976 that then President Ford of the United States noted that:

> "This imposition of a military solution in Angola will have the most profound long-range significance for the United States. The United States cannot accept as a principle of international conduct that Cuban troops and Soviet arms can be used for a blatant intervention in local conflicts, in areas thousands of miles from Cuba and the Soviet Union, and where neither can claim a historic national interest. If we do so, we will send a message of irresolution not only to the lead-

ers of African nations but to United States allies and friends throughout the world."

42. And where do the leaders of the most powerful democracy stand today? On 17 February of this year, President Reagan drew parallels between what he described as the freedom fighters opposing Communist régimes in Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and Cambodia and the *contras* seeking to overthrow the Sandinists in Nicaragua. He said:

"These brave men are fighting to undo the infamous Brezhnev doctrine, which says that once a nation falls into the darkness of Communist tyranny it can never again see the light of freedom."

43. A few days later, the American Secretary of State, Mr. Shultz, asked why, if Communist dictatorships felt free to aid insurgencies, must the democracies, the targets of this threat, be inhibited from defending their own interests and the cause of democracy itself. By repealing the Clark amendment, the United States has acknowledged the admissibility of rendering support to the democratic forces in Angola.

44. Will this commitment to freedom go further than phrases, or will the democratic countries stand aside while the people of Angola fight on alone against overwhelming odds? And what of the countries of Africa? What became of the strong support for FNLA (*National Front for the Liberation of Angola*) and for UNITA which existed in January 1976, when half the countries of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) had steadfastly refused to recognize the MPLA? Do they imagine that the ravenous tiger has changed its objective? Do they not know that, while they have been throwing stones at South Africa from their front door, the tiger and her cubs have entered their house by the back door?

45. Despite their speeches against South Africa in the Council, many of the African representatives who participate and will participate in this debate accept in their heart of hearts the truth of what I have said, because we, the people of Africa, have all suffered under imperialism. We know that Africa fears the tiger. We know that the African countries waited in vain for the West to help them chase it away. But they should know also that if they do not raise their voices now, they will surely one by one fall prey to Soviet imperialism.

46. There should be no doubt about where South Africa stands on these issues; it stands with all true Africans against the forces of the new imperialists.

47. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Once again, exactly three months since we last met to consider a complaint of Angola against South Africa, the Council is confronted with another instance of blatant South African aggression against Angola. In this year alone, this is the sixth occasion on which the Council has met to consider one or the other of the transgressions committed by the Pretoria régime, be it repression unleashed against innocent people in an attempt at the consolidation of the repugnant system of *apartheid*, the continued illegal occupation of Namibia or acts of unprovoked aggression against Botswana and other front-line States. That, in itself, is a telling commentary on the intransigence of the *apartheid* régime, on the defiance it flings at the Security Council, the United Nations, and the entire international community—we have had a further demonstration of this in the statement we have just heard—and on the extent to which the Council's time and energies are spent in dealing with the threats to peace and security posed by Pretoria.

48. The representative of Angola has, with his customary eloquence and in tragic detail, apprised the Council of the latest instance of unprovoked, unjustified and brutal aggression committed by South Africa against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

49. We are, of course, well aware that South African troops have for a long time now illegally remained in occupation of parts of Angolan territory, and Pretoria's professions of its desire for peace and coexistence in the region have hoodwinked nobody. The Council has time and again condemned South Africa for aggression against Angola and demanded the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all its occupation forces from Angolan territory. The last such occasion was on 20 June this year, in resolution 567 (1985), following the dastardly raid on the Malongo oil complex in Cabinda Province.

50. Angola has known no peace since its independence in 1975, and South African aggression against that country has posed a continuous threat to it. Indeed, it is one of the many ironies of the situation that those who make so much of the presence of foreign troops in countries of the region should choose deliberately to turn a blind eye to the sustained, illegal South African military presence in Angola.

51. The Government of India condemns this latest act of aggression. Equally, the entire Movement of Non-Aligned Countries condemns the aggression once again being perpetrated against Angola. The Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries—and, I might add, many representatives of non-aligned countries also—were in Luanda only a fortnight ago for the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which was hosted by the Government of Angola. We were able to witness for ourselves the damage and suffering caused to Angola by the continuing pressure exerted by South Africa against it, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and United Nations resolutions and the commitments which the South African Government had itself undertaken. We were also able to experience at first hand the indomitable courage of the people of Angola and its Government and their unswerving determination to protect and preserve the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola against all attacks and threats emanating from South Africa. It is no matter for surprise, therefore, that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries is united in expressing and committing itself to firm solidarity with the Government and people of Angola.

52. Notwithstanding the vain attempts made by South Africa to offer justification for this latest act of aggression, the facts before the Council are clear and leave no room for ambiguity. South Africa's action is impermissible and in violation of South Africa's Charter obligations. The pretext of so-called hot pursuit advanced by Pretoria must be rejected with the contempt it deserves. South Africa has no business to be in Namibia in the first place, to say nothing of its use of that territory as a springboard for aggression against independent African States. It is the duty of the Council, I submit, to censure South Africa.

53. I have just referred to the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Luanda from 4 to 7 September 1985. In the Final Political Declaration of that Conference,

> "The Ministers . . . emphasized the special political significance of convening the Conference in the People's Republic of Angola, a front-line State in the vanguard of the struggle against the abhorrent system of *apartheid*. They expressed the full solidarity of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with the Government and people of Angola on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the independence of that country, in their efforts to consolidate their national independence, preserve their territorial integrity and freely to undertake the task of national development" [*S/17610 and Corr.1, annex I, para. 10*].

In the same document,

> "The Ministers strongly condemned the Pretoria régime for the continued military occupation of part of the territory of the People's Republic of Angola and considered this an act of aggression against the entire Non-Aligned Movement.
>
> "They called for a complete and unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops from the territory of Angola and decided to increase material support to the Angolan Government, to enable it to consolidate its national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.
>
> "The Ministers hailed the Government of the People's Republic of Angola for its political will and diplomatic flexibility in the search for a peaceful and negotiated solution of the problems of southern Africa . . .
>
> "The Ministers strongly condemned, on the other hand, the duplicity and bad faith of the racist régime of Pretoria in its negotiations with the Government of the People's Republic of Angola as evidenced by acts of aggression, such as the recent sabotage attempt on the oil complex installations of Malongo in the Cabinda Province; and the attempt to supply large quantities of war material in Malange by aerial means, to the puppet and mercenary groups [*ibid., paras. 76-79*]."

54. The non-aligned countries have stood by Angola steadfastly and will continue to do so. The Council, too, has in the past stood by that beleaguered Member State. We hope that it will do so again, this time not merely by condemning South Africa's aggression and calling for its immediate and unconditional withdrawal, not only by once again upholding Angola's right to recompense for the enormous human and material losses it has sustained, but, most of all, by acting resolutely to implement its own decisions in that regard.

55. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Council has before it an item that in the past became a matter of tragic periodic routine, when consciences were asleep and impunity was conceded by conformity. But today, when all the peoples of the world have finally come to understand the suffering and the hope involved in the South African tragedy, and when a universal movement of political and moral consciousness is beginning to mobilize the action of Governments towards the achievement of a definitive solution, this latest attack upon peace and security cannot be accepted or condoned. If it were, if we dealt with it leniently or with indifference, world public opinion, now so aware of the South African problem, would rightly demand that we go further in the search for effective sanctions in order to bring about the desired results. To that end, it is essential to determine, for example, the source of the weapons with which South Africa carries out its attacks. Who is arming South Africa? We have the inescapable responsibility, as members of the Council, to provide that essential information.

56. With the aim of doing its utmost to contribute to the triumph of justice and reason in South Africa and to close ranks with the countries that are victims of aggression, Peru a few days ago established formal diplomatic relations with Angola, and it is about to do so with Zimbabwe and all the other front-line States. The delegation of Peru is therefore ready to approve the most severe measures and to respond with the utmost rigour to the latest attack upon the brother people of Angola. The circumstances of that attack are such as to make it one more offence not only against that nation, the whole of Africa, the hundred non-aligned countries, but also against the whole international community, which today joins in a universal movement of repudiation of *apartheid* and condemnation of the acts of aggression resulting from the senseless attempts to preserve it, against the tide of history. The delegation of Peru therefore stands ready to support the action the Council adopts on this matter.

57. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour and privilege to address the Council today in my dual capacity as representative of Madagascar and Chairman of the Group of African States for the month of September.

58. Exactly three months to the day after the adoption of resolution 567 (1985), the Council finds itself obliged, in spite of itself, to meet once again to consider the armed invasion committed by the racist armed forces against the People's Republic of Angola and the threat that invasion poses to both regional and international peace and security. The facts have been described cogently and in detail

by the representative of Angola, and I shall not rehearse them.

59. As if the atrocities committed daily by the racist Pretoria régime against the black people were not enough, South Africa, in keeping with its policy of arrogance and disregard of the law, again invaded southern Angola on 16 September. The pretext given was that the invasion was carried out in order to pursue elements of SWAPO. In our view, that act of aggression committed by the South African régime constitutes an act prejudicial to international law and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

60. It is ironic to note that South Africa, which undertook as of April this year to withdraw all its occupation forces from southern Angola, seeks to justify its latest act of military aggression by an alleged threat to the security of Namibia, a Territory that it is occupying illegally.

61. Such a justification, based on the theory of so-called preventive action, is unacceptable in the framework of positive international law. Indeed, acting as both judge and party in its consideration of a situation which it presents as a threat to its own security, South Africa has not hesitated to use force and to violate the territorial integrity of a sovereign State. Because of its vagueness and subjective nature, such a theory would permit any State to consider as dangerous to its security any action taken by its victim, even if it were in keeping with internationally accepted norms. That is the antithesis of the right of self-defence as recognized by Article 51 of the Charter.

62. The Pretoria régime wishes to divert the attention of the international community from its domestic difficulties resulting from the struggle of the South African people to dismantle the *apartheid* system. That régime is thus defying the norms of international law by violating the national sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola and by launching an attack more than 200 kilometres deep into its territory from the northern border of Namibia. Those recent events show once again that South Africa, which claims to be the constable of southern Africa, is seeking to impose and institutionalize State terrorism to its own benefit while manifesting its scorn for the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

63. It is precisely the flagrant nature of this act of aggression which has aroused the reprobation of the entire international community. Even countries which are considered to be South Africa's allies have denounced it and have called upon it to withdraw its forces from southern Angola.

64. In order to discourage and pre-empt such acts committed by a Member State in violation of the Charter, we call upon the Council to act decisively by making use of the means available to it under the Charter. We are thinking in particular of the implementation by all States of the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in resolution 418 (1977); the recognition of Angola's right to appropriate compensation for losses and damage resulting from the acts of aggression of the Pretoria régime, which could be evaluated through an investigation by a fact-finding committee; and finally, the application of urgent, effective pressure against South Africa to induce it to respect the relevant Council resolutions and to meet its obligations under the Charter.

65. The Group of African States hopes that the Council will heed these demands, which are the bare minimum we can ask for in view of the gravity of South Africa's act of provocation and its harmful implications for the maintenance of international peace and security.

66. In this connection, I wish to recall that the most recent summit meeting of the OAU vigorously condemned South Africa's repeated attacks against independent neighbouring African States, expressed the solidarity of the whole of Africa with the front-line States, and recommended specifically that needed assistance be provided to the front-line States, including the People's Republic of Angola, with a view to strengthening their capacity to defend themselves against acts of aggression by South Africa. It also proposed the imposition of binding sanctions against South Africa and expressed the view that peace in southern Africa can be guaranteed only by the abolition of the system of *apartheid* and a negotiated settlement of the question of Namibia.

67. Mr. KASEMSRI (Thailand): Members will recall that on 20 June 1985, the Council adopted resolution 567 (1985), in which, *inter alia*, it strongly condemned South Africa

> "for its recent act of aggression against the territory of Angola in the Province of Cabinda as well as for its renewed intensified, premeditated and unprovoked acts of aggression, which constitute a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country and seriously endanger international peace and security". That resolution further strongly condemns South Africa for its utilization of the international Territory of Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating its armed attacks as well as sustaining its occupation of parts of the territory of Angola.

68. Today, after a lapse of only three months, the Security Council has been convened once again to consider another complaint by Angola against South Africa. In his letter of 18 September 1985 [*S/17472*], the representative of Angola drew the attention of the President of the Security Council to "the most recent violent acts of armed aggression committed against the people and territory of the People's Republic of Angola by the racist régime in South Africa", by once again crossing the Angolan border on 16 September 1985 and engaging in "acts of wanton destruction and brutality against Angola".

69. According to news reports—and, indeed, in the statement of Pretoria's representative this morning—the South African authorities have admitted that their forces have in fact invaded Angolan territory. The pretext given was that they were engaging in so-called pre-emptive

strikes from the territory of Namibia against the nationalist forces of SWAPO.

70. Namibia is not part of South Africa, and it is being illegally occupied by South Africa. One might then ask, what business do South African forces have in Namibia in any case? SWAPO, on the other hand, is recognized by the General Assembly as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. SWAPO forces are waging a legitimate struggle against the South African presence in Namibia in order to enable the Namibian people to rid themselves of the illegal occupier and to exercise their right of self-determination. All those facts are well recognized by the overwhelming majority of the international community. Accordingly, any military incursion or act of aggression by South Africa from Namibian territory against a neighbouring country, on any pretext whatsoever, constitutes a gross violation of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

71. Furthermore, South African actions are yet a further proof of South Africa's intransigence, in defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions. Indeed, in South-East Asia a similar situation exists, which continues to threaten not only the territorial integrity and security of my country, Thailand, but also international peace and security. It is therefore patently clear where Thailand stands on the question before us.

72. Thailand has consistently, and in the strongest possible terms, opposed and condemned South Africa's acts of aggression against the front-line and other States, as well as its illegal occupation of Namibia.

73. Today, my delegation wishes to reiterate Thailand's steadfast position in this regard. We demand that the racist Pretoria régime cease its lawless acts and immediately and unconditionally withdraw its illegal presence from Angolan and Namibian territories. Moreover, South Africa must fully compensate the People's Republic of Angola for all the damage that the South African forces have caused, as well as desist from any further violation of Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity.

74. It is also incumbent upon the Council to help ensure once and for all that South Africa comply fully and without further delay with all its relevant resolutions, including resolution 567 (1985) of 20 June 1985.

75. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Hardly three months have passed since the Security Council considered the aggression by the racist Government of South Africa against Cabinda Province in Angola, before that same racist Government committed a new act of aggression in which it used hundreds of soldiers and penetrated deep into Angolan territory, invoking the usual pretexts to the effect that it launched that action as a pre-emptive strike against the Namibian freedom fighters.

76. This new act of aggression against the territory and sovereignty of Angola is being committed at a time when the black majority in South Africa has risen up, calling for its legitimate right to equality, liberty and human dignity, and when a universal campaign of condemnation has escalated in an unprecedented fashion against the racist practices of the Pretoria régime.

77. Although such aggression is not new to the Pretoria régime, we cannot but wonder at the reason for renewed acts of aggression being launched at this very time, in spite of the internal revolt being faced by the régime and the condemnation of its practices and conduct by the outside world. At the beginning of this meeting, we heard a statement by the representative of Angola in which he answered these queries very clearly. He had already referred to these questions in his letter to the President of the Council, in which he requested an urgent meeting of the Council.

78. We in turn wonder whether the racist régime, by its latest aggression against Angola, seeks to demonstrate to us and to the world that it takes no notice of the denunciation and condemnation of its practices and actions and will persist in its racist practices and aggression at home and abroad. If the régime is attempting, by means of this aggression in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations to divert attention from what is happening inside South Africa itself, that attempt is doomed to failure, because such repeated acts of aggression only serve to emphasize the aggressive nature of the régime at home and abroad.

79. The aggression by the Pretoria régime against Angola and its racist practices against and brutal suppression of the black majority, in addition to its persistence in illegally occupying Namibia, all reflect the ideology of that racist régime, which has based its actions solely on the highest degree of violence in its relations with neighbouring States as well as its attempts to impose its abominable policy on the majority of the people within South Africa.

80. The delegation of Egypt would prefer to limit its statement, because the option before us is to take the necessary steps rather than to speak at length about that which we all know full well. Suffice it to say that the Security Council, in its resolution 567 (1985), strongly and clearly condemned the aggression committed at the time by the racist Government of Pretoria against the territory of Angola and the utilization by that régime of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for that aggression. It also demanded that South Africa cease all acts of aggression against Angola and respect its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

81. However, this racist régime repeated its aggression on 16 September, and did so in yet greater strength. Will the Security Council still confine itself to condemnation and appeals, in the face of this blatant defiance by the racist régime of Pretoria? Each act of aggression by South Africa against its neighbours is an act of defiance against the prestige and authority of the Council as the supreme international organ for the maintenance of international peace and security. At the same time, that prestige and authority is weakened if the Council fails to adopt the measures called for by this continuous aggression.

82. Millions, not only in Africa but in scores of countries in the third world, have their eyes on the Security Council on the eve of the fortieth anniversary session of the United Nations. In Egypt's view, it is high time that the Council prevents its resolutions from being disregarded and sees to it that they are implemented. The Charter provides machinery which makes it possible for the Council to discharge that duty. We consider it incumbent upon us to show the racist régime of Pretoria the position of the Council on this aggression against Angola and the violation of its sovereignty, and to do so in such a way as to leave no room for doubt. The Council should adopt the necessary measures to force the racist régime to heed its resolutions and to respond to the appeal by Angola, the victim of aggression.

83. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The racist régime in South Africa, not content with its brutal treatment of the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa itself, has constantly and openly committed acts of aggression against independent African States. Perfectly confident of its impunity, South Africa has once again committed an act of aggression against the sovereign State of the People's Republic of Angola. Once again, innocent people have lost their lives. A great number of people have been seriously wounded and a great deal of material damage has been sustained, as we were told today by the representative of Angola.

84. The attack on Angola is just one more link in the chain of misdeeds committed by the South African militarists and a further proof that the *apartheid* régime not only represents an inhuman system of racial oppression but also poses a constant threat to international peace and security. In order to eliminate it, urgent international efforts and action are needed.

85. There can be no doubt that this new act of aggression against Angola, like all that have preceded it, is aimed at intimidating the front-line States and forcing them to abandon their support for the liberation movements. On the other hand, as pointed out in the letter from the representative of Angola [*ibid.*], the expansionism of racist South Africa "is obviously designed to draw international attention away from the conflagration that is engulfing the racist *apartheid* minority régime in Pretoria".

86. This new act of provocation by the South African racists demonstrates that the ruling régime in that country is continuing to pursue its policy of destablization against independent African States. In so doing, the racist Pretoria régime is not only deliberately ignoring the numerous decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council with regard to the normalization of the situation in southern Africa, it is openly flouting the norms of international law.

87. At a time when the world community is celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and once again dedicating itself to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the South African régime is cynically flouting those very purposes and principles.

88. Such provocative behaviour by the Pretoria authorities and the defiant statement made here today by the representative of South Africa both are the result of the patronage and support that the South African racists have enjoyed and continue to enjoy from their powerful Western patrons—first and foremost, the United States. We can hardly attach serious significance to the limitations on economic ties with South Africa that were recently put forward by the United States Administration, since those so-called sanctions are accompanied by a host of qualifications and loopholes. There have been absolutely no perceptible changes in the essence of the United States position with regard to the *apartheid* régime, excepting that "constructive engagement" with South Africa is now being called "active engagement".

89. Once again, we are forced to note that it is that precise policy of the United States Administration towards the Botha régime that is one of the main reasons for that régime's increasing aggressivity, and that it has nurtured the régime's illusions of being able to act with total impunity.

90. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic vehemently condemns the new and unprovoked act of aggression by South Africa against Angola and declares its firm solidarity with the people and Government of Angola. We believe that the time has come for the Council to fulfil its duties under the Charter in a decisive manner, to adopt effective measures against the *apartheid* régime and, in accordance with the Charter, demand that it call a halt to its aggressive actions.

91. Events in southern Africa have disturbed people in many countries. International organizations have condemned the Pretoria authorities. Many Governments and a broad spectrum of public opinion in many countries throughout the world have done the same. Many international forums now being held have condemned the aggressive policy of the Pretoria régime; last week, parliamentarians of the Western European countries participated in a seminar held at Amsterdam and issued a condemnation of that régime. Appeals for a boycott against the South African régime have been heard this year in Bonn, instigated by the Green Party. There have been striking exposures of the role played by transnational corporations and monopolies in South Africa and Namibia, some of which were heard at the hearings held here at United Nations Headquarters. Last week in Hungary a representative international seminar was held at which I headed a delegation from the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. The participants at that seminar called upon the Security Council to bring its powerful authority to bear in favour of the restoration of legitimacy and order in southern Africa and to put into effect comprehensive and binding sanctions against the Pretoria régime under Chapter VII of the Charter.

92. It is difficult to find new language to condemn the aggressive acts and criminal policy of the *apartheid* régime

in words that have not already been uttered here, but we must search for such words and such language. We need active and concerted efforts by all members of the Council.

93. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

94. Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): I should like first of all to extend to you, Sir, my sincere felicitations on your assuming the presidency of the Council and thanks for allowing the delegation of the Brazilian Government to make a short statement here today.

95. As soon as the Brazilian Government was informed of the most recent act of armed aggression against the territory of the People's Republic of Angola by South Africa, the Brazilian Minister for Foreign Affairs sent a telegram to his colleague, the Angolan Minister for Foreign Affairs [*S/17475*], which I would like to read to the Council:

> "I have just been informed that the aggressive *apartheid* régime has invaded the south of Angola from the illegally occupied territory of Namibia. At this crucial moment in history in which there has been a flagrant and unacceptable violation both of the sovereignty of Angola and of the basic principles that govern relations between civilized States. Your Excellency and the entire Angolan nation may rest assured of the solidarity of the Brazilian Government and people."

96. In fact, the circumstances in which this last South African attack against Angola has taken place are crucial. While the entire international community is following with grave concern the cycle of violence spreading within the boundaries of South Africa at a moment when international opinion seems to be mobilized against *apartheid* to an extent never before witnessed, in a year when the Security Council has issued several expressions of condemnation against the aggressiveness of Pretoria towards its neighbours, the South African régime has retaliated by striking once again with brutal strength a peaceful country whose only guilt is the solidarity it offers to its African brothers.

97. No justification could be acceptable for the present act of aggression. Just as was the case when South Africa tried to sabotage economic targets in Cabinda, not even the physical proximity of a concrete menace to that country can now be alleged. Any violent act by Pretoria aimed at defending its position in Namibia constitutes a crime in defence of illegality. No excuse for pre-emptive strikes against SWAPO can be disguised by the notion of self-protection. South Africa's presence in Namibian territory is itself illegal.

98. As we approach the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the total defiance by South Africa of the strong stance taken by the international community on the crisis in southern Africa should justify effective action by the Security Council. The recurrent acts of aggression against neighbouring States are not only a transgression of international law; we are hearing the cries of despair of a régime doomed to fail. In fact, that régime is being dismantled by the antagonistic forces its very existence tends to generate. We should not, however, fail to take concrete steps to make Pretoria cease its aggressive acts against Angola and other countries in the region. The United Nations has indeed played an important role in mobilizing international public opinion against the acts of aggression of the Pretoria régime, and we have to go further in our concerted action for the total eradication of the racist and violent policies of South Africa.

99. As a Latin American country, as a sister country of Angola, Brazil has consistently affirmed its solidarity with the Angolan people and Government, as well as with the people of Namibia. Several countries have already adopted, at different levels, sets of sanctions against South Africa. Brazil is one of them. Taken collectively, these individual actions represent a concrete contribution to the dismantling of the structure of an aggressive Government. Their reach is, however, limited. Effective measures can only lead to more tangible results if supported and adopted by the international community as a whole. We should not feel discouraged by the brazen attitude of South Africa in disregard of international law. Common determination and common deeds will force Pretoria to abide by the rules of civilized coexistence among States.

100. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Senegal, Mr. Ibrahima Fall. I welcome him and invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. FALL (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. Abdou Diouf, President of the Republic of Senegal and current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, I should like to convey to you, and through you to the members of the Security Council, our gratitude for your allowing me to take part in this very important debate on the repeated acts of aggression of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola. I am not merely following tradition when I say that my pleasure in so doing is increased by the fact that you are guiding the work of the Council with a competence and impartiality that is recognized by all on behalf of the great country which you represent here, the United Kingdom, with which Africa has special, long-standing relations based on mutual respect.

102. I also wish to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Oleg Troyanovsky, the representative of the Soviet Union, for the exemplary and responsible manner in which he led the work of the Council in August.

103. President Abdou Diouf has just addressed a message to the President of Angola which reflects Africa's disapproval and condemnation of the State terrorism practised by South Africa. I will now read that message to the Council:

> "The incorrigible supporters of *apartheid* have once again deliberately violated the territorial integrity and

sovereignty of independent Angola. This heinous act of destabilization, committed under the false pretext of "hot pursuit" of SWAPO fighters, constitutes undeniable aggression in the terms of international law.

"The segregationist régime of Pretoria has chosen the eve of the session of the General Assembly during which the fortieth anniversary of the entry into force of the Charter of the United Nations will be commemorated to show how little it respects the San Francisco document. Indeed, this raid against southern Angola rides roughshod over the spirit and the letter of the most fundamental provisions of the Charter.

"In these serious circumstances, the OAU, through me, reaffirms to the courageous people of Angola the active solidarity of Africa, which is saddened and revolted by such arrogance. But let there be no mistake—no acts of intimidation, however barbarous and wanton, can enable the *apartheid* régime to escape a truth which has been clearly established by history. As shown yesterday in Asia and more recently in this same southern part of our continent, the will and the determination of peoples struggling to conquer or safeguard their independence and dignity have been irresistible. The last bastion of denial of the rights of the black man will not escape this historical truth.

"I reaffirm to the brother people of Angola the determination of Africa to continue to give it its firm support and solidarity in its struggle."

104. The serious act of aggression South Africa has just committed against Angola is part of a context that is clear in its true dimensions. Indeed, faced with the resolute stand of the vast majority of the South African people against the odious and inhuman policy of *apartheid*, imposed in violation of all norms of national and international objective law and rejected by the community of States as a whole, the Pretoria régime has made of the state of emergency decreed since 21 July 1985 a situation of principle in support of which it has intensified repression against the legitimate aspirations of the South African people.

105. The international community has reacted by unanimously condemning that escalation, which is arbitrary and has worsened the situation prevailing in South Africa as a result of Pretoria's acts—a situation that was already a cause for concern. The Council itself, reflecting the general reproach, has condemned the establishment of the state of emergency. Far from complying and understanding that, as is obvious to everyone, the only way to preserve a viable future in southern Africa is the establishment of a system of equality, democracy and fraternity with freedom for all, the South African Government has preferred the relentless pursuit of the same policy of arbitrary massive repression, marked by arrests and deliberate assassinations against the anti-*apartheid* forces. The failure of that policy is obvious today, as is shown internally by the glorious resistance of political forces, trade unions and religious, student and other forces, and externally by the quantitative and qualitative increase in international pressure for sanctions against Pretoria.

106. Refusing to learn the lessons of history, South African President Pieter Botha, in a statement that had been awaited with hope by those who were beginning to wonder about his lucidity, has just reaffirmed his resolve to pursue application of the *apartheid* policy, thus showing that blind and bloody intransigence constitutes the only response of the South African Government to the martyred people of South Africa, to the peoples and the Governments of Africa and to the conscience of the world as a whole.

107. Externally, this policy of desperation and political blindness translates in occupied Namibia into the establishment of a so-called interim government, in disregard of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Externally also, with regard to the neighbouring African countries, Pretoria has established destabilization, aggression and invasion as principles of neighbourliness. Thus, after many others, the aggression against Angola which is now being discussed here shows once again that Pretoria is resolved to continue to defy the entire world, including the Powers that still harbour a slim hope that a glimmer of lucidity will come to the South African authorities.

108. Only a few days after the holding at Luanda of the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, a meeting during which the most important group of States in the world expressed its active solidarity with Angola in the face of Pretoria's acts of aggression against it; only a few days after the decision on limited economic sanctions taken by the United States, Canada and the countries of the European Community; a few weeks after the meeting of the Security Council held at the request of France at which important measures were adopted that were seen by all those who continue to have confidence in the United Nations as conveying a formal warning to the Republic of South Africa; and finally, coming on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the San Francisco Charter, which is the fundamental basis of current international relations, South African aggression against Angola offers further evidence that South Africa does not and will not take into account any decision of the Council other than mandatory and binding sanctions in accordance with the serious responsibilities conferred upon it by the Charter of the United Nations.

109. The statement just made here by the representative of Pretoria attests to the fact that not only does South Africa persist and will continue to persist in its policy of aggression against Angola and against other front-line States, but also, ironic as this may be for the country of *apartheid*, it claims that its action against the legitimate Government of Angola is an action in favour of the so-called liberation of the Angolan people, a people for which the Pretoria representative has even claimed to speak here. This is no more and no less than brazenly overt imperialism.

110. The South African Government's internal and external policy of obstinancy and defiance of reason and

law creates an increasingly explosive situation in the southern part of the African continent, a situation that is without question seen as a threat to international peace and security.

111. The OAU, whose support for the cause of the liberation of Namibia, the cause of the struggle against *apartheid* in South Africa and the cause of solidarity with the front-line States is based on its constituent charter, once again appeals to international opinion, and in particular to the Governments of countries to which the Charter of the United Nations confers primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world and to which South Africa continues to show its ill will and blind obstinacy. The Organization of African Unity, presided over by President Abou Diouf, whom I have the honour to represent here, echoes the call of African peoples addressed to the international community represented by the Security Council. It asks, must we wait for Pretoria to set ablaze the entire African continent before we consider that South Africa's actions endanger international peace and security and before taking appropriate measures?

112. The time has certainly come to respond to the legitimate aspirations of the African peoples and, beyond that, the peoples of the whole world, by taking the decision to condemn South African aggression against Angola and to implement global and mandatory economic sanctions, the only steps capable of bringing the leaders of Pretoria to reason. In so doing, the Security Council would be advancing the cause of human rights and peace in the world, fundamental aims of the Charter.

113. The Council is in duty bound fully to shoulder its responsibilities towards Angola, the front-line States and the international community in order to avoid a repetition of such actions. This would also be the occasion for the Council to determine ways and means to implement the relevant decisions of the United Nations on Namibia.

114. Mr. President, I finish as I began by thanking you and, through you, the Council as a whole for having given me the opportunity to address you in the name of the current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Joseph Garba, Chairman of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. GARBA (Chairman, Special Committee against *Apartheid*): Mr. President, let me first of all thank you and members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in this meeting on behalf of the Special Committee against *Apartheid*. I should also like, on behalf of the Special Committee, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. The Special Committee and, indeed, the international community, look forward to the adoption by the Council under your leadership of meaningful measures against the criminal and aggressive régime of South Africa.

117. Once again the Security Council is meeting to consider the acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria régime against one of its neighbouring independent African States. It was as recently as 20 June that the Council adopted resolution 567 (1985) condemning the *apartheid* régime's criminal acts of aggression against Angola. On that occasion [*2596th meeting*], the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola told the Council that the South African régime's operation was a calculated effort to destabilize Angola and suffocate it economically. Earlier, in May, the Secretary-General issued a statement expressing concern at South Africa's military operation in Angola.

118. Since gaining independence a decade ago, Angola has been invaded by South Africa more than a dozen times. This and other acts of aggression by South Africa have been repeatedly and strongly condemned by the Security Council, which has demanded the immediate withdrawal of the invading South African forces and has affirmed the right to prompt and adequate compensation from South Africa. The Council has also requested Member States to extend all necessary assistance to the victims of South Africa's aggression.

119. Yet the Council's resolutions have not had the slightest impact on the *apartheid* régime. In June last, within the space of 48 hours, South Africa was condemned three times by the Security Council for its acts of aggression against Angola and Botswana and for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and installation of a so-called interim government in that Territory.

120. In May, the South African army tried to sabotage oil installations at Malongo, in Cabinda Province. A captured South African soldier then confessed that his unit had sabotaged other strategic installations in Angola. In the same month, Angolan authorities intercepted two South African night parachute drops of weapons to UNITA. All these criminal and dastardly acts took place despite the Lusaka understanding, which was signed in February 1984 between Angola and South Africa and which required the withdrawal of South African forces from Angola. South Africa's acts of aggression and the rebel UNITA attacks supported by South Africa have cost Angola billions of dollars, caused the deaths of tens of thousands of people, displaced hundreds of thousands others and devastated the country's economy.

121. Today, the South African army is still in Angola, purportedly in self-defence, but in reality subverting and destabilizing the Angolan Government. The Pretoria régime has dishonestly argued that it has launched a preventive action in self-defence because SWAPO was planning a campaign of terror in Namibia. A South African armoured battalion has gone 150 miles deep into Angola, accompanied by air strikes as far as 50 miles into the country and the bombing of Angolan forces which were attacking UNITA. The complicity of South Africa is demonstrated by the fact that a South African medical orderly was with the rebel UNITA forces when he was killed in the offensive by the Angolan troops against the UNITA rebels.

122. The South African régime has once again put forward the excuse of hot pursuit or pre-emptive action to justify its latest act of aggression. The right of self-defence is governed by Article 51 of the Charter, which can in no way be invoked by South Africa. There has been no threat to South African territory. On the contrary, South Africa has throughout been the source of aggression and destabilization against its neighbours. The question of self-defence or hot pursuit simply cannot arise in the present case. South Africa has no business in Angola. Its presence there has been declared illegal, repeatedly condemned by the Council and, indeed, is an infringement of international law.

123. This attack on Angola is not an isolated case. It is part of a deliberate policy of deceit and aggression aimed at destabilizing the neighbouring countries. Thus, the *apartheid* régime's acts of aggression and destabilization continue against Mozambique despite the Accord of Nkomati [*S/16451 of 30 March 1984, annex I*], South Africa has all along supplied weapons to the rebel national resistance movement. Just a few days ago, on 16 September, Mozambique's President confronted the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs with proof of the continued involvement of South Africa in the destabilization of Mozambique. President Samora Machel protested to Minister Botha about the serious and repeated violations of the Accord of Nkomati, which was supposed to be a peace agreement. The seriousness of the situation in Mozambique was discussed at meetings this year among southern African States. A few days ago, leaders of six front-line States met in Mozambique to consider the gravity of developments in South Africa.

124. The Lusaka understanding and the Accord of Nkomati were heralded by the racist minority régime as peace initiatives. But they have brought no peace, only more devastation. They were frauds, as are all other changes and so-called reforms offered by that régime, whose purpose is to mislead world public opinion. Now the veil has been lifted, and faced with irrefutable evidence, the racist Minister for Foreign Affairs was compelled to admit that South Africa had brazenly violated the Accord of Nkomati several times since it was signed in March 1984.

125. I hope that this will convince the major Western supporters of the racist régime that that illegal Government does not respond to rational and progressive initiatives.

126. I said at the meeting of the Council on 11 June last [*2585th meeting*] that no dialogue is possible with the Pretoria régime, which has all along defied the resolutions and calls of the United Nations, reneged on its undertakings, committed repeated acts of aggression and destabilization against its neighbours, is bent on perpetuating the criminal system of *apartheid* and continuously violates the Charter. The *apartheid* régime should be dealt with in the manner that it deserves.

127. The Security Council must now answer fittingly the Pretoria régime's defiance of all United Nations efforts towards the elimination of *apartheid*, the independence of Namibia and the maintenance of peace and security in southern Africa. It is long past the time to continue to repose hope in such policies as "constructive engagement" or "active engagement". The repeal of the Clark amendment can now be seen clearly as a tragic mistake.

128. For many years, the Special Committee has urged the adoption of concrete measures to combat the Pretoria régime's defiance of the United Nations and the international community. No longer should the Security Council delay the adoption of meaningful action under Chapter VII of the Charter. We have clearly seen that unless there is some effective pressure, internal or external, the *apartheid* régime shows no disposition to make the slightest move. Undoubtedly there is going to be no peace in southern Africa unless *apartheid* is eliminated and Namibia liberated.

129. The situation in South Africa is fast deteriorating. Not a day passes without blacks being killed by South African security forces; not a day passes without violence and brutality being inflicted on blacks. The emergency measures which were imposed on 20 July, giving unlimited powers to the policy and the army, have worsened a situation which was already irretrievable.

130. The United Nations has a special responsibility towards the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. This responsibility flows from the Charter. The need for effective international action is greater today than ever, particularly on this fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The Security Council has no choice but to condemn racist South Africa, punish it, consistent with the Charter, and demand that that illegal Government render immediate and equitable reparations to the people of Angola. At a time when Member States are increasingly adopting sanctions against South Africa on an individual basis, the Security Council can do no less.

131. Mr. BASSOLÉ (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has already had an opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for September. I should like, however, to add my own congratulations and to vouchsafe to you my readiness to co-operate with you as you discharge your delicate functions. I take this opportunity also to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, who, as usual, presided over the Council with tact and competence.

132. In June 1985, racist South Africa added to its misdeeds the successive violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of two Member States, Angola and Botswana. The Council, whose faith and commitment to exercise its prerogatives under the Charter of the United Nations had been hurt, met and, with is customary wisdom, adopted appropriate resolutions designed to remedy the damage done to those two States and to prevail upon the Pretoria régime to respect the Charter of the United Nations, in the drafting of which the South African racist State may have participated.

133. Those resolutions, like the ones previously adopted by the Council in similar circumstances, had no effect on South Africa's blind and arrogant policy. Pretoria has just committed another act of defiance of the Council by again using force and violating once more the territorial sovereignty of Angola. It is therefore up to the Council, in all objectivity and wisdom, to determine the most appropriate means to meet this challenge. It is time—as we have constantly stated—to stop the South African racist régime in its folly. The Council's decisions must finally show the firmness which has so far been dramatically lacking because of an absence of cohesion within it.

134. The fallacious pretext of the right of hot pursuit, constantly invoked by Pretoria to justify the repeated violations of the Charter of which it has so often been guilty, should not sway the Council in its determination to put an end to these acts of aggression and to ensure and guarantee scrupulous respect for the Council Charter by the most appropriate means, specifically those available to it under the Charter.

135. The racist leaders of Pretoria, in the throes of an explosive internal situation, are seeking, in vain, to divert the international community's attention from the true problems faced by the régime of *apartheid* which they have institutionalized and which they intend to maintain at all costs. The Council should not pay attention to such delaying tactics. It is in duty bound not only to condemn the cowardly and barbarous act of aggression of which Angola has just been the victim, but also, and above all, to apply economic sanctions against Pretoria in order to do justice to the peoples of Angola and southern Africa whose dignity has been flouted.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—January 1995—1,925

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2607th MEETING: 20 SEPTEMBER 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2607)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Complaint by Angola against South Africa: Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)	1
The situation in Cyprus	14

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2607th MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 20 September 1985, at 4.30 p.m.

President: Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2607)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)

The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 19 September 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17474)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the previous meeting, I invite the representative of Angola to take a place at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Cyprus, Guyana, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka) and Mr. Sikaulu (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cuba, Greece and Qatar in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Dountas (Greece) and Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

3. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/17481, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Burkina Faso, Egypt, India, Madagascar, Peru and Trinidad and Tobago.

4. Mr. BIERRING (Denmark): I shall be very brief, since the facts speak for themselves.

5. It is indeed saddening that the Council has to meet repeatedly to discuss South Africa and its aggressive policy towards neighbouring countries.

6. During the Council's deliberations on 20 June last on Angola's complaint against South Africa, we already had a foreboding of the possibility of a renewed meeting in the foreseeable future. At that time there was ample evidence of a considerable concentration of South African troops in northern Namibia along the border with Angola. Our Angolan colleague established convincingly that these troops were going to be used in the future. Regrettably, this has now proved to be the case.

7. Whatever official explanation is given by the South African Government, there is no doubt that South Africa has yet again committed a blatant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity. South Africa's premeditated act of aggression against Angola is under all circumstances indefensible in international law. Denmark has repeatedly voiced its strong condemnation of South Africa's behaviour. It is encouraging to note that even within the white minority in South Africa itself this policy is now being called seriously into question.

8. In our view the Council must reiterate its strong condemnation of South Africa's flagrant violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity and of its utilization of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for armed attacks against Angola. Furthermore, the Council should reinforce its demand for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all South African troops from Angola.

9. It is the duty of the Council to see to it that South Africa finally heeds its decisions.

10. Mr. WOOLCOTT (Australia): I shall also be brief. It is only three months since the Council was called into session to discuss South Africa's raid against Cabinda. On that occasion, the Council, in resolution 567 (1985), strongly condemned South Africa's actions and its use of Namibia as a springboard for armed aggression against Angola.

11. The Australian Government has never accepted that South Africa has any right to dispatch or station forces anywhere on Angolan territory without the consent of the Angolan Government. We therefore welcomed the announcement in April 1985 that South Africa had decided finally to withdraw its troops from southern Angola. Our hopes, however, have been sadly dashed. Once again, South Africa has mounted a cross-border raid into Angola in defiance of international law, in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and in defiance of the resolutions of the Council.

12. South Africa's duplicity has been exposed. Its policies of *apartheid* are tearing South Africa apart; its policies of regional destabilization in Mozambique, in Botswana and in Angola give the lie to its proclaimed wish for good relations in southern Africa. Its most recent attack, deep into Angola, does nothing to bring closer a peaceful settlement in Namibia. That option is available through Council resolution 435 (1978), which provides the means for an early and peaceful transition to independence.

13. South Africa has chosen the path of the gun over the path of negotiation, and its representative had the effrontery in the Council today to try to justify South Africa's action against Angola on the grounds that it was necessary to maintain stability in Namibia—a Territory which South Africa occupies illegally.

14. South Africa's actions in southern Angola must be deplored by the international community. Australia unreservedly condemns these actions and calls on South Africa to cease all aggression against its neighbours.

15. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zambia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

16. Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the high office of President of the Council for the month of September. I also thank you and your colleagues on the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in this debate concerning yet another act of aggression by South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola.

17. The Council last considered a similar complaint by Angola against South Africa barely three months ago. South Africa had the audacity then to dispatch its military forces to the Angolan Province of Cabinda and to sow death and destruction. Needless to say, Cabinda is nowhere near South Africa or the Territory of Namibia, which the Pretoria régime continues to occupy illegally.

18. Now South Africa has committed aggression against Angola in the Province of Cuando-Cubango, more than 200 kilometres from the border with Namibia. Innocent Angolan lives have been lost. Other Angolan nationals have been maimed, and valuable property has been destroyed.

19. The South African act of aggression against Angola in the Province of Cabinda surprised and even angered South Africa's friends in the Western world, coming as it did not long after the purported completion of the withdrawal of its troops from that country in keeping with the Lusaka agreement and, indeed, as vital American Gulf Oil installations were earmarked for sabotage and destruction. The Council, as did world opinion in general, strongly condemned South Africa and demanded an end to all such acts of aggression, as well as strict respect by South Africa for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. But, as it has consistently done since Angola's independence, South Africa ignored the demand of the Council. It treated resolution 567 (1985) with contempt, as its present aggression against Angola clearly demonstrates.

20. South Africa, of course, always has a pretext for its mischievous conduct. It is a master at concocting excuses for its actions and will insist on them no matter how ridiculous they may be to reasonable people everywhere. Now South Africa is seeking to convince the world that it invaded Angola in pursuit of freedom fighters of SWAPO (*South West Africa People's Organization*). That, in the twisted logic of the South African régime, should impress the world and legitimize the act of aggression itself.

21. We know from the facts provided by Angola that there was no contact at all between the SWAPO freedom fighters and the South African troops of aggression, because the SWAPO freedom fighters were simply not in the area invaded. South Africa attacked, killed and wounded Angolan soldiers. Its mission was to render support to the UNITA (*National Union for the Total Independence of Angola*) forces fighting against the legitimate Government of Angola. That is, indeed, in keeping with the well-known position of South Africa in support of UNITA in Angola, the so-called Mozambique National Resistance Movement in Mozambique and other dissident elements in front-line and other independent States in the region.

22. But South Africa would still be guilty of aggression against Angola even if it had sent its troops to attack SWAPO freedom fighters more than 200 kilometres inside Angolan territory. South Africa, which is illegally clinging to Namibia, has no right whatsoever, under any pretext, to violate the territory of Angola.

23. This is the same South Africa which, in order to perpetuate its illegal occupation, introduced the so-called linkage between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. Because of that

totally unjust and extraneous issue, resolution 435 (1978) remains unimplemented to date. The refusal by South Africa to co-operate in the implementation of that resolution, aimed at the peaceful transition of Namibia to independence, has left the Namibian people with no choice but to struggle by all means possible for the freedom and independence of its country. And by what right can South Africa, which is dedicated to the destabilization and even overthrow of the Government of Angola, demand the withdrawal of Cuban troops from that country?

24. Angola has put before the Council a convincing case. By coming to the Council, Angola has once again demonstrated that it is a peace-loving State and a faithful Member of the United Nations. Zambia, needless to say, fully supports all the demands of Angola articulated in the statement by my brother, Mr. Elísio de Figueiredo. For its part, Zambia strongly and unreservedly condemns South Africa's latest act of aggression against Angola.

25. For many years the Council has been discussing the problem of South Africa's acts of aggression against Angola and other independent countries in the region. For many years the Council has been discussing the problem of South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia. Indeed, the Council has been confronted with the problem of *apartheid* in South Africa. Those three problems are the problems of our region of southern Africa. They are responsible for the absence of peace and security in the region and for the tension and turmoil that prevail.

26. In reality, the main problem of our region is *apartheid*. It is in defence of *apartheid* that South Africa relentlessly commits acts of aggression against, and destabilization of, independent countries in the region. It is in defence of *apartheid* that South Africa persists in its refusal to yield to the demands of the Namibian people for freedom and independence.

27. The scourge of *apartheid* is therefore the heart and soul of the problems of southern Africa. Beyond any action that the Council may take in this specific case of the aggression against Angola, it is important that there be proper and adequate focus on the need urgently to take effective measures for the eradication of the evil system of *apartheid* in order to establish conditions of durable peace and security in southern Africa. Now is the time for the Council to act decisively, particularly in the light of the grave situation in South Africa.

28. In his report[1] to the General Assembly on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, the Secretary-General has suggested that the Security Council should, in the near future, make a deliberate and concerted effort to solve one or two of the major problems before it by making fuller use of the measures available to it under the Charter of the United Nations. Zambia fully agrees, and ventures to suggest that *apartheid* be one such problem for action by the Council. Only then will the problems of southern Africa be resolved once and for all.

29. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Sri Lanka, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Asian States for the month of September. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

30. Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to express the views of Sri Lanka, Chairman of the Group of Asian States for this month, on the armed invasion of Angola by South African forces. The Council is indeed fortunate in having you, Sir, to guide its deliberations during the month of September, and I am sure we shall benefit from your wide experience and wisdom. Let me also express the thanks of my delegation to Mr. Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the Council's work last month.

31. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sri Lanka participated in the Conference of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries, held at Luanda barely two weeks ago. Speaking on behalf of the Asian members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, he said:

> "The choice of Luanda as venue for the Conference is more than symbolic. It sharply focuses the attention of the non-aligned on the crisis that confronts the African continent. At the political level, Angola stands in the front line in the battle against *apartheid* and racist minority rule. The people of Angola deeply cherish freedom and resolutely oppose racism. This commitment has been demonstrated by Angola's ceaseless battle to preserve its independence against the evil empire of *apartheid*."

32. Angola must not be alone in its struggle against *apartheid*. These meetings of the Council have been convened to draw attention to and take suitable international action against the acts of aggression being committed by Pretoria against the independent State of Angola. The representative of Angola has given the Council a clear and detailed report of the aggressive actions that the South African régime has taken and continues to take in Angola.

33. My country, along with the other members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, has always deplored the actions of the minority Government of South Africa as it has continued to engage in acts of aggression against the front-line States, in the latest instance a fellow country member of the Movement, Angola.

34. The Council has demanded that South Africa scrupulously respect the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of Angola. Despite the resolutions that we have adopted and despite the universal condemnation heaped upon South Africa for its perfidious conduct in destabilizing Angola, the racist Government of South Africa continues to divert attention from its putrid policy of *apartheid* at home by forays which the international community condemns in unequivocal terms as the desperate acts of a doomed régime.

35. South Africa, in this instance and in the instances that we have recently seen, continues to serve its own selfish purposes by mounting from time to time aggressive incursions into the front-line States. By now the international community in general and the Security Council in particular must surely recognize these acts of cowardice as threats to the peace and security not only of southern Africa but of the entire world.

36. These aggressive acts and raids into the front-line States will no doubt be resisted by the peoples of those States. When aggression is heavily backed up with the exploited resources of an oppressed black people, such acts of aggression are all the more deplorable. Resources that could be used to develop black southern Africa, which has suffered for so long, and provide it with some relief after the exploitation of centuries are now being wasted in inhuman and criminal forays against Angola on the spurious grounds that these are pre-emptive strikes against an enemy which only the myopic leaders of South Africa can see, sitting as they do on a powder barrel which might at any moment now blow up.

37. The leaders of the present South African Government demonstrate time and again their incapacity to recognize their true purpose and continue to act narrowly in a single-track vision of their own claim to superior thought.

38. Without recognizing the legitimate claim of the black majority to their rights, as citizens of their country, to self-determination and independence, the white minority Government of South Africa continues to use its policies of *apartheid* both internally to oppress the black majority within South Africa and externally to hurl brute force against the front-line independent States striving to liberate their peoples from the shackles of economic want and deprivation.

39. The non-aligned countries are committed to supporting the black majority people of South Africa against the racist policies that are being imposed on them by brute force. The non-aligned countries are deeply committed to safeguarding the interests of the front-line States and to protecting them against the armed aggression, expansionism and destabilization that the racist South African Government continues periodically to launch against them. These periodic strikes and forays are, in our perception, the last desperate strikes of a régime that is doomed. No longer is the international community prepared to watch in stony silence these acts of aggression against Angola and the front-line States.

40. By its actions, the South African régime continues to demonstrate that its credibility has dipped below the bottom line. The international community is not prepared to accept the hypocritical protestations of this racist régime that it is acting in self-defence.

41. We are aware that the front-line States, along with SWAPO, have co-operated with the United Nations and the Security Council at all times. They have borne a heavy burden and are paying a bloody price for their patience. The assurances we have received in the past have come to naught in practice, and the responsibility for that situation does not lie with the front-line States, SWAPO or the Government of Angola. The time is now at hand when the Council must call upon the Government of South Africa to halt its campaign of terrorism against its neighbours and its own black majority. The lives of thousands of innocent victims have been taken in the inhuman and criminal violations that South Africa's white minority régime continues to perpetrate in its campaign of terror.

42. Therefore, I have no hesitation, as the representative of a non-aligned country which has the highest respect and regard for the democratic process and for law and order, in calling upon the Council to put an end to the senseless inhumanity that the minority régime in South Africa continues to practise.

43. Once again, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of Sri Lanka and the Group of Asian States, of which I am Chairman for this month.

44. Mr. ALLEYNE (Trinidad and Tobago): On 20 June 1985, the Council was seized of the question of the raid by South Africa's racist military force in the province of Cabinda, Angola. Resulting from its deliberations at that time, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 567 (1985), which condemned South Africa for that act of aggression against the territory of Angola as well as for its renewed, intensified, premeditated and unprovoked acts of aggression against that country. The resolution demanded that South Africa unconditionally and immediately withdraw its occupation forces from the territory of Angola and cease all acts of aggression against that State. Moreover, the Council decided to remain seized of the matter.

45. Three months to the day after the unanimous adoption of that resolution, which signalled to the Pretoria régime the Council's unreserved condemnation of South Africa's aggressive attacks on Angola, we are once more considering a South African military incursion against Angola. The raid by South Africa's racist forces in southern Angola beginning on 16 September 1985 is but the latest in the long chain of aggressive acts and territorial violations by the *apartheid* régime against Angola and, indeed, against other neighbouring States in southern Africa. These unprovoked and persistent acts of aggression constitute a flagrant and callous violation of international law.

46. My delegation wishes to register its total rejection of the South African régime's pretext for violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. From the standpoint of international law, there is no inherent right to engage in military activity across one's borders on the basis of that activity being a pre-emptive strike or hot pursuit. Accordingly, under contemporary international law there can be no legality for a military action or a military pre-emptive action across borders into the territory of another country.

47. The action of the South African forces against Angola is therefore clearly in violation of international law. That is particularly the case since this adventurism was supposedly undertaken on behalf of a Territory which is illegally occupied by South Africa in defiance of United Nations resolutions and contrary to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice.[2] Accordingly, the fact that South Africa launches military attacks from Namibia under the doctrine of hot pursuit or pre-emptive strike compounds the unacceptability and illegality of the act.

48. The question, then, is what is to be done in this year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, when Member States are seeking to reaffirm the role and authority of the United Nations and of the Council in respect of the non-use of force in international relations and other principles of international law. What action must be taken against a State that constantly, persistently and callously disregards international law and the will of the international community in the area of the non-use of force in international relations?

49. The Trinidad and Tobago delegation wishes to reiterate that the appropriate mechanisms for taking action under these circumstances exist in Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. We are of the view that South Africa's policy of aggression towards Angola must be condemned unanimously by the Council. We of the Trinidad and Tobago delegation are convinced that a strong signal should be sent to the racist régime. It must be made abundantly clear that the international community will not allow a State, on the basis of an archaic and abhorrent theory of human relations or some alleged manifest right, to use the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating armed attacks or for the occupation of the territory of Angola. Such actions by South Africa threaten international peace and security. That a Territory for which the United Nations is responsible should be used in this manner by South Africa shows the callous nature of the racist South African régime. The Council must act with unanimity on the draft resolution before it and thereby dispel any illusions on the part of the *apartheid* régime about the commitment of the Council to maintain international peace and security and fully to implement the Charter. Our actions in the Council today should serve as a clear and unambiguous warning to South Africa of the Council's determination to oppose violations of international law relating to the non-use of force, and should also serve as a deterrent against future armed attacks by South Africa in Angola.

50. At a time when the *apartheid* régime is desperately seeking to divert world attention from its crumbling racist society and when, in the face of the inevitable demise of the *apartheid* system, the régime is attempting to bolster the waning confidence of the racist minority, it is imperative that the Council take decisive action now by instituting certain provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. The Council must condemn these acts of aggression. But condemnation has not so far proved a deterrent. The Council must unanimously decide that strong sanctions be imposed by the international community as a whole against the Pretoria régime.

51. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Cyprus. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

52. Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Cyprus): It is a pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for the month of September. We are fully convinced that, with your well-known experience and diplomatic skill, you will successfully guide the deliberations of the Council. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend our congratulations to your predecessor, Mr. Troyanovsky of the Soviet Union.

53. This is the second time in three months that the Council has met at the request of the Government of the People's Republic of Angola as a result of South African aggression.

54. On 20 June, the Council was informed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Angola of the aggression committed against Angola by South African insurgent forces. Despite the overwhelming condemnation by the international community of the racist régime of South Africa for its acts of aggression and destabilization against the non-aligned neighbouring country of Angola, the Pretoria régime has paid no heed; instead, it is once again involved, as was lucidly described this morning by the representative of Angola, in a new escalation of aggression against his country—this time with the excuse that it is defending itself from attacks by forces of SWAPO.

55. The South African régime, which maintains the largest and by far the best equipped military force in southern Africa, launches massive ground and air strikes against Angola, expecting the world to believe that that is done in self-defence.

56. The contempt of the Pretoria régime for the international community and international law is well known, and has been condemned repeatedly by this body.

57. The termination of South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and the establishment of the United Nations Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory until independence make South Africa's oppressive presence in the Territory illegal.

58. The fact that South Africa uses the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for military operations and other subversive acts against neighbouring States adds another dimension to its disrespect for international law and its contempt for the international community. By intensifying its aggression against the front-line and neighbouring States and, in this particular case, against Angola, the *apartheid* régime of South Africa is aiming at intimidating those countries into submitting to political arrangements that would neutralize them as opponents of *apartheid*. Moreover, through this naked aggression the Pretoria

régime is trying to prevent the independence of Namibia for as long as possible.

59. The latest round of military aggression against Angola clearly shows that the *apartheid* régime has never been interested in peace and stability in the region. The assertion of South Africa that the ongoing military operations in Angola were undertaken to protect Namibia from attacks by SWAPO forces must be considered totally unacceptable and to be a cover for Pretoria's disrespect for the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Angola.

60. Only a few weeks ago, Angola hosted the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which considered, among other international issues, the situation in southern Africa. The Ministers condemned the continued occupation of part of Angolan territory by South African troops, declared that they considered that occupation as an act of aggression against the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and demanded the unconditional withdrawal of the South African troops.

61. It is the Council's duty to act firmly and effectively in order to put an end to the South African aggression against Angola. The *apartheid* régime must be made to understand in very clear terms that its aggression cannot be tolerated. Otherwise, international peace and security will continue to be seriously threatened, and the prestige of the Organization will be further tarnished.

62. To the people and Government of Angola, the people and Government of the Republic of Cyprus extend their fullest solidarity and support.

63. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

64. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, allow me to begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency for September. Throughout the three years in which we have shared work together at the United Nations, my delegation has always appreciated your qualities as a gentleman and your diplomatic skill. These qualities have greatly facilitated the important work of the Council this month.

65. I also wish to congratulate the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Troyanovsky, on the equanimity and sense of responsibility with which he presided over the meetings of the Council in August.

66. At the same time, Sir, through you, I should like to thank the other members of the Council for giving me an opportunity to take part in this debate.

67. The critical situation in southern Africa is a subject of special concern to my Government which shares the anxieties of the international community as to the uncertain future of that important region.

68. In our statement to the Council on 20 June last, we said that the repeated violations of the territorial sovereignty of Angola and other African States by South Africa deserved the unanimous repudiation of the international community and a fitting response from the Council. We now reiterate that position. We condemn with the utmost emphasis the new and unwarranted armed aggression by South Africa against Angola, and we repeat our appeal to the Council to respond appropriately and effectively to this latest demonstration of the expansionism and intolerance which are the driving force behind Pretoria's policies. It is essential that the Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should ensure the preservation of the political and moral authority of the United Nations by not allowing conduct such as that which we are now examining to go unchallenged. The Council should demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the South African invasion forces.

69. During the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries held recentlly at Luanda, Governments represented there had a chance to see for themselves the seriousness of the situation created by the repeated armed attacks by South Africa against the sovereign territory of Angola. At the same time they were able to gauge the spirit of sacrifice of the Angolan people and their determination to resist those attacks unflinchingly. The paragraphs of the Final Political Declaration adopted by the ministerial Conference which were read out this morning by the representative of India are eloquent testimony to the firm backing of the non-aligned countries for Angola in this difficult time.

70. The general situation in southern Africa is developing in a direction which is increasingly dangerous for international peace and security. The gravity of the global conflict covering the region cannot be disregarded, nor should it be minimized. *Apartheid* and South Africa's refusal to implement immediately and unconditionally the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia are the factors primarily responsible for this situation. As the General Assembly has repeatedly stated, the inhumane régime of *apartheid*, which every day subjects millions of human beings to the horror and degradation of racism, is an affront to the conscience of the world. In the closing phase of a century which has witnessed unprecedented social, political and technological progress, the survival of this anachronistic vice of intolerance is damaging not just to its most direct victims but to the entire international community.

71. That same intolerance is impeding the long delayed independence of Namibia, unjustly denying the people of that Territory the exercise of their inalienable right to self-determination. The South African Government itself has acknowledged that the current aggression against Angola is aimed at tracking down and eliminating the forces of SWAPO, which has been recognized by the General Assembly as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people.

72. As we have pointed out on other occasions, Argentina firmly supports the quest for peaceful and negotiated solutions to the crisis in southern Africa. We continue to encourage dialogue and the quest for formulas which will ensure the establishment of free, democratic and egalitarian societies in that region.

73. Pretoria and those which advocate the continued existence of *apartheid* should realize that an harmonious and balanced way out of the present conflict will be possible only by means of a profound and fundamental change in the unjust internal order of South Africa. The South Africa Government should realize that rigidity and intransigence are the worst enemies of its own interests. It is the responsibility of the international community to ensure that that Government is persuaded of this fact. The actions which the Council may take will play a fundamental role in this context.

74. For our part, we have unilaterally taken measures in the diplomatic, economic, cultural and sporting spheres against South Africa. As long as *apartheid*, the illegal occupation of Namibia and attacks against African States continue, Pretoria can only expect mounting support by my country, Argentina, for the legitimate struggle of the oppressed peoples of southern Africa to gain the full realization of their inalienable rights.

75. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Council has met today urgently to consider the question of the recent acts of aggression by the racist régime of South Africa against the People's Republic of Angola.

76. Just three months ago, on 20 June, the Council strongly condemned South Africa for its act of aggression against Angola and the gross violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country. It further strongly condemned South Africa for its utilization of the Territory of Namibia as a springboard for perpetrating its armed attacks against Angola, and demanded that South Africa should unconditionally withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces from Angola, that it cease all acts of aggression and scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the People's Republic of Angola.

77. Thus, the Council clearly and firmly stated its attitude to the aggressive actions by the racist régime of Pretoria and, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, described them as a threat to international peace and security.

78. How did Pretoria react to that clear condemnation of its actions by the Security Council, the body of the United Nations primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security? Not only did it disregard that decision by the Council, not only did it not put an end to its policy of aggression against independent Angola, but it significantly increased the scale of its aggressive war against that neighbouring sovereign country.

79. Continuing the policy of State terrorism and armed intervention against its sovereign neighbours, the military clique of South Africa and its regular troops, with the support of its air force, again violated the borders of Angola and made incursions deep into Angola's territory and airspace. The armed forces of South Africa are conducting hostilities against the people's army of Angola in order to give direct military support to the terrorist gangs of UNITA mercenaries, organized and supplied by Pretoria. As a result of the bandit-like attack by South Africa, Angola has suffered casualties; people, including civilians, have been killed and wounded, and senseless destruction has been caused.

80. These criminal actions by the South African racists are a gross violation of the Charter and international law. This is a new escalation of the racist aggression against Angola. This act of aggression has increased the threat to peace and security not only in southern Africa but far beyond its borders. For many sovereign African States, it has increased the danger of war that constantly emanates from that hotbed of racism in South Africa.

81. By continuing this undeclared war against Angola, the Pretoria régime has defied the United Nations and the entire world community, which has demanded that an end be put once and for all to South Africa's aggression against neighbouring sovereign States.

82. The statement by the representative of South Africa in the Council this morning has shown that the racist Pretoria régime is not demonstrating any readiness to heed the loud and clear voices of protest and condemnation in the Council. The Government of South Africa has turned a deaf ear to the demands of the majority of the States of the world and continues to issue threats against neighbouring countries; it presumes to act as an international policeman in Africa and is using Namibia, which it illegally occupies, as a springboard for the expansion of its aggression against its neighbours.

83. As before, the South African racists have been trying to cover up their crimes against the African peoples by using hackneyed inventions about the Soviet-Cuban danger.

84. The aggressor has been acting cynically and treacherously, in the hope, which it still maintains, that its outrages will go unpunished, that it will get away with them because it has influential protectors and supporters in the West. No one has any doubt at all that Pretoria would not dare to counter the will of the overwhelming majority of States in the world if it did not have the support of a number of Western Powers, primarily the United States, which has blocked in the Security Council the imposition against the racist South African régime of the effective collective enforcement measures that are clearly spelt out in the Charter.

85. The oral statements by some Western Powers, with references to regret and friendly chiding of Pretoria, and their trifling micro-sanctions delude no one, because these statements are at variance with their deeds, their real policies. Today too there are no real signs that the Western

Powers are finally prepared not to stand in the way of the adoption by the Council of effective measures to curb the wanton aggressor, to put an end to its policy of aggression and State terrorism against neighbouring States.

86. These long overdue effective measures—and this has been repeatedly stated by African countries—can and must be the binding comprehensive sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter. This has been repeatedly suggested by African and other countries in the Council.

87. Those are the facts; those are the realities.

88. The Soviet Union decisively condemns the aggression of the South African racists against Angola and other African countries, and also the military and political support given to Pretoria by a number of countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in their attempts to break South Africa's political isolation and to stand in the way of the imposition against South Africa of comprehensive binding sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Our country expresses its solidarity with friendly Angola, with which the Soviet Union has a treaty of friendship and co-operation.

89. The Soviet Union appeals to all States and to the Security Council to take effective measures that would force the racist régime to heed the demands of world public opinion, halt its policy of aggression and State terrorism against neighbouring States and abide by United Nations decisions on the granting of independence to Namibia. The Soviet Union calls for an immediate halt to aggression against Angola and for the withdrawal by the South African racist troops from the territory of Angola.

90. We are convinced that the Council should not confine itself to another mere condemnation of South Africa's acts of aggression. It should take decisive, effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter. This is necessary in order to maintain international peace. It is necessary in order to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and the other States in southern Africa. It is necessary, finally, in order to strengthen the authority of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole and their influence in questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security.

91. Mr. LI Luye (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened very carefully to the forceful complaint by the representative of Angola against the recent armed aggression into Angolan territory by the South African authorities. We express our indignation and strong condemnation of the acts of aggression by the South African racist régime. We also express our sympathy with and support for the Government and people of Angola, the victims of aggression.

92. The South African authorities have for a long time occupied Namibia, using it as a springboard for the carrying out of repeated acts of aggression and destabilization against Angola, causing the Angolan people to suffer very serious losses in life and property.

93. On 16 September, South Africa once again dispatched troops to invade Angola, thus grossly trampling on the norms of international relations. This constituted a new threat to the peace and security of southern Africa as a whole. It was both necessary and timely for the Council to hold an emergency meeting to deliberate on this emergency situation.

94. The South African authorities, on the pretext of safeguarding their security, wilfully carry out aggression against their neighbouring countries. At the same time, South Africa claims that it is ready for peaceful talks. It accuses the African front-line States and national liberation organizations of disrupting the peace in this area. However, over the years its record on internal suppression and external expansion fully demonstrates that it is precisely the perverse acts of the South African racist régime that cause turmoil in the region of southern Africa.

95. The new acts of aggression committed by South Africa against Angola further demonstrate that, contrary to what it claims, South Africa has no intention of solving the problems of southern Africa through peaceful talks. It tries to use its armed forces to intimidate the weak and to violate the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the neighbouring countries.

96. At a time when the Conference at Luanda of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries had come to a close, when the fortieth session of the General Assembly was about to begin and when more and more countries in the world were condemning the South African authorities for persisting in their policy of *apartheid* and other evil acts, South Africa once more launched aggression against Angola. This is indeed an open challenge to the international community.

97. The Security Council, as an important organ for the maintenance of international peace and security, must fulfil the functions entrusted to it by the Charter of the United Nations. It must demand that South Africa immediately and unconditionally withdraw all its forces of aggression from Angola. It must also compel South Africa to implement all Security Council resolutions. If South Africa persists in its obstinate position, then the Council should consider adopting appropriate measures as called for by the Charter.

98. The Chinese Government and people have always resolutely opposed and strongly condemned the system of *apartheid* practised by the South African authorities, its acts of aggression and destabilization against a neighbouring State and its illegal occupation of Namibia. We maintain that, in the interest of peace and security in southern Africa, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola and other front-line States should be respected. Namibia should be independent as soon as possible, and the system of *apartheid* of the South African régime should be abolished.

99. While commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, the international community should close its ranks, co-ordinate its action and strive for the implementation of all the relevant resolutions on southern Africa adopted by the Council.

100. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Cuba. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

101. Mr. ORAMAS OLIVA (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency for this month. I also wish to express our gratitude to Mr. Troyanovsky, representative of the Soviet Union, for the diplomatic skill and manifest ability with which he guided the work of the Council in August.

102. Once again, South Africa, by its aggressive and criminal policy, has obliged the members of the Council to convene, even though barely three months ago we saw with what indignation the international community responded to the cowardly and unsuccessful act of aggression carried out against Malongo, in Cabinda.

103. On this occasion, using unjustifiable pretexts and invoking the dangerous doctrine of pre-emptive strikes which is fraught with such grave consequences for international peace and security, the racist armed forces crossed the sovereign frontiers of the People's Republic of Angola and pressed on 250 kilometres inside Angolan territory in order to carry out indescribable acts of brutality and their brand of State terrorism.

104. We listened to the explanation of the representative of the racist régime of Pretoria, who, this morning yet again, gave us an example of the unbelievable defiance and contempt with which the *apartheid* régime treats this lofty body. In a cynical manner, he lied as to the true motives behind this act of aggression, which was designed, first, to check the offensive of the forces of FAPLA (*People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola*) against the bandits of UNITA in the south of Angola, where they have suffered heavy casualties in the last few months, and secondly, to divert the attention of the international community from the current situation in South Africa and the brutal and cowardly manner with which the racist forces have killed hundreds of black citizens and gaoled and tortured thousands of people merely because of their opposition to the *apartheid* régime. Yet the representative of *apartheid* still has the gall to speak before the Council about freedom and violations of human rights.

105. How long will South Africa go on taxing the patience of the peoples? How long will racist South Africa continue to benefit from the pious and indulgent attitudes of certain Western countries, which thereby are merely encouraging the disciples of Hitler who hold the reins of power in Pretoria?

106. We salute all those who have sincerely adopted resolute measures against South Africa, and we hope that those who, through their actions, could contribute to changing the insane course upon which Pretoria has embarked will abandon the policy of constructive engagement and join in the efforts of the international community to end the ignominious system of *apartheid*, which is not just a nightmare for the black masses of South Africa but also a grave threat to peace.

107. Angola and the other African countries which have been victims of systematic aggression by South Africa are entitled to live in peace and to devote all of thier resources to the rebuilding of their countries and to their social and economic development in the interest of the well-being of their peoples. It is high time that the Council which bears responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, allows itself to act in keeping with its mandate under the Charter of the United Nations. It is high time that the obstacles be eliminated so that the Council can apply against South Africa the sanctions provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

108. On this occasion, we wish to reiterate the unswerving solidarity of the people and the Government of Cuba with the fraternal people and Government of Angola, and we urge the international community to redouble its political, moral and material support for Angola in the face of the brutal acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria racists.

109. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Greece. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

110. Mr. DOUNTAS (Greece): Allow me at the outset, Mr. President, to thank you and the members of the Council for acquiescing to my request to address the Council on the subject under discussion.

111. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. I am certain that with your wide experience and diplomatic skills you will successfully carry out your duties.

112. I should like also to extend my congratulations to the representative of the Soviet Union Mr. Troyanovsky, on the way in which, in his usual exemplary manner, he guided the deliberations of the Council last month.

113. Upon instructions from my Government, I have asked to speak to state before the Council the Greek position on the deplorable events which have led to the present meeting of the Council. I am referring to the raid into the sovereignty territory of the People's Republic of Angola by armed forces of South Africa. We consider this armed intrusion an act of aggression, which we condemn, as we have consistently condemned all such acts of agression no matter where they have occured, no matter who the perpetrator has been. Such acts are in flagrant violation of the fundamental provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law in general and should not remain without consequences.

114. It is not the first time that the armed forces of South Africa have violated the sovereign territory of Angola. Their raid into Cabinda is fresh in our memories.

115. This last ongoing invasion is not an isolated phenomenon. It falls within the pattern of South African policy both in its domestic dimension and as regards its attitude towards its neighbours. On the one hand, South Africa attempts to show that it wishes better relations with its neighbours by signing agreement with them; on the other, it ignores the very agreements it has signed, and perpetuates its policy of aggression and destabilization. As long as South Africa continues to enforce internally the universally detested system of *apartheid*, which deprives the majority black population of elementary human and political rights, and as long as it oposes the full implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978) with regard to Namibia, the situation in the whole of southern Africa will continue to deteriorate. The population of South Africa will continue to suffer immensely. The legitimate interests of its neighbours will be subject to its abuses.

116. We express the hope that the Government of South Africa will finally take the necessary steps in order that *apartheid* may be eliminated and the human and political rights of the population of South Africa restored.

117. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Qatar, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as Chairman of the Group of Arab States for the month of September. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

118. Mr. AL-KAWARI (Qatar) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, I should like to thank you for allowing me to participate in the deliberations of the Council on the item before us.

119. I will not repeat the details of the act of aggression committed against that African country detailed by previous representatives. It is important, however, that I reaffirm, on behalf of the Group of Arab States, that the acts of aggression by South Africa against the territory of a sovereign State Member of the United Nations, Angola, are a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of international law on which is based the legal system of the international community.

120. The Group of Arab States strongly condemns these repeated acts of aggression. It is high time to put an end to those acts, to deter the aggressor State and to impose the sanctions provided for in the Charter so that that State ceases its unjust policies, returns to legitimacy and respects the provisions of the Charter.

121. The flimsy pretexts put forward by the South African régime are baseless and illegal. We have heard such pretexts concerning preventive attacks before in our region of the world. Israel has resorted to such flimsy pretexts in order to justify its acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. Now it is South Africa that seeks to justify its acts of aggression against Angola. We condemn this attitude in both cases and call upon the Organization and the Security Council to redress the situation. We call upon the Council to reject emphatically these flimsy pretexts in order to strengthen the foundations of the international system, to deter aggression and ultimately to maintain international peace and security, which these insane adventures have placed in jeopardy.

122. We are confident that the Council will shoulder its responsibility and adopt a strong resolution, consistent with the provisions of the Charter which reject the use of force in international relations and seek to safeguard international peace and security.

123. Mr. de KÉMOULARIA (France) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, may I begin by joining my colleagues in expressing our great pleasure upon having you in the Chair, with the qualities which we know you to possess, and in wishing you full success at the presidency in a month which is so important in the life of the United Nations and, naturally, of the Security Council.

124. I should also like to join with those who have paid tribute to the representative of the Soviet Union, our friend and colleague, Mr. Troyanovsky, for his wise presidency and for the experience he lent to our proceedings.

125. For the second time in a few months, the Council is convened to consider a complaint from Angola against South Africa, which has unleashed a new armed attack on its territory. This policy of aggression, of which Botswana also was a victim last June, shows that serious tension in the region persists.

126. The operation launched by the South African armed forces in southern Angola from Namibian territory is a clear violation of international law. Hence, my Government most vigorously condemns this unprovoked attack. We demand the immediate withdrawal by South Africa of all its troops and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the People's Republic of Angola.

127. We cannot accept the pretexts put forward by the South African Government, according to which this attack is to be viewed as preventive action against the forces of SWAPO. They do not threaten the territory of South Africa, and nothing authorizes Pretoria to conduct military operations in Angola in the name of the inhabitants of Namibia.

128. Whatever the objectives or the reasons given for these military operations by South Africa, they are directly linked with the continued illegal South African presence in Namibia and the refusal of the Pretoria Government to accept the immediate and unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978). In his report of 6 September 1985 [*S/17442*] to the Security Council on the implementation of resolution 566 (1985), the Secretary-General had to note that the South African Government maintained its position regarding the "linkage" of the implementation of the

United Nations settlement plan and the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. My delegation deplores this intransigence and recalls that we want an unconditional implementation of resolution 435 (1978) without any preconditions.

129. Once again the French Government reaffirms its solidarity with the Government of Angola. We once again appeal to South Africa to put an end to the cycle of violence in southern Africa and to embark upon a course of dialogue and understanding with its neighbours in the region. It is therefore first and foremost important for South Africa to put an end forthwith to a military operation which—and let me strongly emphasize it again—France most strongly condemns.

130. Mr. OKUN (United States of America): The United States strongly deplores all cross-border actions. They are totally inimical to the search for peaceful solutions to the problems besetting southern Africa. We have communicated our concern and displeasure regarding this large-scale South African incursion into Angola to the South African Government. It is the long-standing position of the United States Government as well as the international community that South Africa's presence in Namibia is illegal. Consequently, we are not sympathetic to South African assertion of any right to conduct military expeditions into Angola under the theory of defending its illegal presence in Namibia. We have asked that all parties in the border areas between Namibia and Angola act with restraint.

131. This has been and continues to be our position. We urge, therefore, the immediate withdrawal of South African forces.

132. The PRESIDENT: As there are no more speakers, I should like to make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM.

133. The United Kingdom maintains friendly relations with the People's Republic of Angola. No one is better placed to attest to this than the representative of Angola, who, to our pleasure, is also the Angolan Ambassador accredited at the Court of St. James in London.

134. The United Kingdom sees no justification in the violation of Angola's sovereignty and territorial integrity by South African forces. Time and again we have expressed this view in debates in the Council on Angola. Time and again we have joined other members of the Council in calling upon South Africa to withdraw completely its forces from Angola and to respect Angola's sovereignty. Time and again we have deplored all cross-border military actions, which cannot but undermine the prospects for peace and stability in the southern African region. As recently as June this year we expressed strong condemnation of the South African attacks on Cabinda in Angola and on Gaborone in Botswana.

135. Following the latest South African incursion into Angola, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London stated the British Government's view as follows:

> "We strongly condemn this incursion into Angolan sovereign territory by South African defence forces. Such acts can only undermine the stability of the region and damage efforts to achieve Namibian independence.
>
> "We urge South Africa to withdraw her forces at once. The British Government believes that the longer-term prospects for the security of the region depend on mutual respect for borders and on urgent progress towards implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) leading to internationally recognized independence for Namibia.
>
> "We are making these views known to the South African Government through diplomatic channels."

There is, therefore, no ambiguity in our attitude to these deplorable events and no room for confusion about where the United Kingdom stands.

136. The representative of Angola has properly seized the Council of this renewed attack, and the Council has before it a draft resolution [*S/17481*] with which we are in general sympathy and for which my delegation will vote. The text of the draft resolution does not fall within the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations nor constitute a formal determination thereunder, but it expresses in clear and strong terms the Council's condemnation of the South African attack. My delegation does not interpret operative paragraph 5 as endorsing the intervention of combat troops from other countries in the affairs of the region. As is well known, my Government is concerned that any such intervention risks widening the conflict and is likely to exacerbate the problems of finding peace in the region.

137. However, I do not need to remind the Council of the United Kingdom's support for the stability and territorial integrity of all the front-line States, support which has been expressed in a practical, effective and appropriate way by our bilateral assistance to those States over many years.

138. The United Kingdom accordingly hopes that the Council will adopt the draft resolution and that this will serve as a clear signal to the South African Government of the unambiguous views of the international community. We call upon South Africa to withdraw its forces immediately.

139. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT of the Council.

140. It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall now put the draft resolution to the vote.

141. I have been informed by the sponsors of the draft resolution of the following revisions: In paragraph 5 there is a small revision, which consists in deleting the words

"capabilities in the face of" and substituting the words "capacity against"; the words "against these countries" should be deleted.

142. In order to make this quite clear, I will read paragraph 5 as it now stands after the revisions:

> "*Requests* Member States urgently to extend all necessary assistance to the People's Republic of Angola and other front-line States, in order to strengthen their defence capacity against South Africa's acts of aggression;".

143. If there is no objection, we will now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution as orally revised.

144. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): Could we possibly have, under rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure, a short recess to discuss this matter a bit further before we put it to a vote?

145. The PRESIDENT: Does the Council agree with this request?

146. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Is that possible under the rules of procedure, since we have started the process of voting?

147. The PRESIDENT: I am open to expert opinion, but my personal understanding is that once the voting procedure has started, it should not be interrupted. However, perhaps in the circumstances, the request of the representative of the United States might be met.

148. Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): How long would you intend this break to be, Mr. President?

149. The PRESIDENT: Let us say 10 minutes.

150. Mr. KRISHNAN (India): Could we, through you, Mr. President, request all members of the Council to stay in the chamber or nearby so that we can reconvene in 10 minutes?

151. The PRESIDENT: I am very clearly in favour of that proposal.

152. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): I presume it is understood that this will not set a precedent or introduce any changes in the provisional rules of procedure.

153. The PRESIDENT: That is certainly my understanding. In that case we will postpone the next step for 10 minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 6.45 p.m. and resumed at 7.05 p.m.

154. The PRESIDENT: Before the suspension of the meeting, the President had got to the point of putting to the vote the draft resolution as orally revised. We are now back at that point.

155. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): I wish to thank all the members of the Council for their understanding of my request for a short pause, as I have the slowest pencil in the West.

156. Since the only paragraph with which we have any difficulty is operative paragraph 5, I should like to ask whether, under rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, we could have a vote on paragraph 5 and then proceed with a vote on the rest of the draft resolution.

157. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to that? There being no objection, it is so decided. I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution as orally revised.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution as orally revised was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

158. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as orally revised.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted unanimously [resolution 571 (1985)].

159. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Angola.

160. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to thank you, Sir, and all those who spoke out in support of the Angolan position in connection with the South African aggression against my country and people. I also wish to thank all of our friends and well-wishers for the assistance rendered to us with regard to this meeting.

161. During the time between this morning's meeting and this afternoon's meeting of the Council, I wondered briefly whether it was at all worth our collective time and trouble for me to respond to the ludicrous issues and allegations contained in the statement made by the representa-

tive of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. But then I reconsidered and decided that such outrageous charges should not be allowed to go unanswered, charges which, if they were not so dangerous, would simply be pathetic. It was obvious that the *apartheid* régime really had to dig long and hard to locate quotable quotes to bolster its very weak and even non-existent case. And when I referred to the charges as dangerous, I did not mean that others would give them credence, but that the racists themselves would believe their own lies.

162. I wish to state very briefly that no Cuban internationalist has ever crossed the borders of Angola. What the Government and people of Angola do inside our territory is entirely our own business. Angolan territory belongs to the Angolans. Pretoria's assertions about "an increasing flow of evidence that SWAPO was intent on staging some major terrorist operation" are so patently false that they need not have bothered with this feeble excuse. What increasing flow of evidence? What major operation?

163. The reputation of the South African armed forces, their military intelligence unit and their state security apparatus is so well known that "admissions" obtained by them are of no worth and would never stand up in any court of law except that of the racists and run by the racists. The mysterious "deaths" and "suicides" of people under racist detention are also a matter of international knowledge and public record. And the description of the present massive armed invasion of Angola has been described by the racists as "a follow-up operation". Follow-up to what? Follow-up to the confession of a tortured Namibian patriot, even if the story of the arrest is true—which it is not? Follow-up to an imagined, unimplemented ghost operation? By whom, where, and when?

164. Even a cursory look at past Council records will reveal that the racists undertake a brutal invasion, and then, as soon as a Council meeting is called on the subject, they announce the "commencement" of the withdrawal of their troops. Sometimes the "withdrawal" takes years to complete, and more often than not it is never completed before yet another violent operation is put into effect.

165. My Government, my delegation and I myself have always had the highest regard for the proceedings of the United Nations, and in particular for those of the Security Council. We are conscious of the need for a serious approach, especially when the circumstances are so serious and even tragic. But without disturbing the seriousness of the intent, purpose and proceedings of the Council, may I be permitted to regale all members with a moment of levity. Can we sit here with serious faces while the representative of the racist, minority *apartheid* régime of South Africa—a country whose so-called Government is rejected by the majority of South Africans, a régime that kills children, little children, a régime where the country's majority is at war with its minority, a régime that denies even the basic human rights to the people it has systematically disenfranchised, a régime whose violence against the people of South Africa is daily displayed in the world press, in newspapers, on television, over the radio, a régime which is fast losing its most trusted allies and partners, a régime which is in illegal occupation of Namibia—while, I say, the representative of such a régime dares to refer to self-determination, free elections (in a country where the majority inhabitants do not have the vote) and human rights?

166. The "ravenous tiger" referred to by the racist representative is well known to him—it is none other than the animal of *apartheid* itself. And it is equally ridiculous to hear the Pretoria representative speak of "imperialism", again a subject well known to him, since today the only imperialists in southern Africa are the South African racists. And when he says "we, the people of Africa", surely he jests; for him, "we, the people of Africa" refers only to the minority that rules South Africa. When for the Pretoria racists "we, the people of Africa" really means the people of Africa, then there will be no further Security Council meetings on that subject.

167. In conclusion, I wish to thank all members of the Council once again. My Government is indeed gratified at the show of support it has received from the Council today.

168. The struggle continues. Victory is certain!

169. Mr. WALTERS (United States of America): The United States welcomes the occasion of this Council meeting to reiterate our call for an immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory. We join all the members of the Council in deploring the South African incursion into Angola. Acts of this nature can only frustrate the hopes and endeavours of all those seeking peacefully to resolve the problems besetting southern Africa.

170. My Government is one of those convinced that southern Africa needs fewer guns, fewer soldiers and fewer bullets. What will the introduction of more weapons of war into the area—which would result from the implementation of paragraph 5 of the resolution we have just adopted—accomplish? The answer is simple: an escalation of violence in an already volatile situation, more death, more misery. Our diplomatic efforts are aimed at the achievement of a peaceful settlement in this region. South Africa has no justification for violating Angolan sovereignty. Angola needs peace, not more foreign troops, foreign intervention and imported arms.

171. The United States supports the territorial integrity of Angola and deplores the fact that it has been violated. We call on South Africa to halt this and any further acts of aggression against neighbouring States. But we cannot vote in favour of a call to arms. For that reason, my delegation abstained in the vote on paragraph 5 of the resolution. Since the rest of the resolution was acceptable to us, I had no hesitation in voting for it.

172. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The situation in Cyprus

173. The PRESIDENT. Before we adjourn, I should like to make the following presidential statement on behalf of the members of the Council.

174. The Security Council has been seized with the Cyprus question since 1964. The members of the Council have been kept informed of the efforts begun by the Secretary-General in August 1984 as part of the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Council.

175. On 20 September 1985, the members of the Council heard an oral report from the Secretary-General, in the course of which he conveyed his assessment that his initiative had brought the positions of the two sides closer than ever before and expressed his conviction that what had been achieved so far should lead to an early agreement on the framework for a just and lasting settlement of the Cyprus question in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Recalling their support for the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus, members of the Council expressed strong support for the mission of the Secretary-General under his mandate from the Council.

176. The members of the Security Council, therefore, call upon all parties to make a special effort in co-operation with the Secretary-General to reach an early agreement.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Supplement No. 1* (A/40/1).

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.